

THE LORD'S DAY:  
SUBSTANCE OF A SPEECH

*DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF THE PRESBYTERY OF  
GLASGOW, ON THURSDAY, 16th NOVEMBER, 1865.*

BY  
NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D.,  
MINISTER OF THE BARONY, GLASGOW;  
AND ONE OF HER MAJESTY'S CHAPLAINS FOR SCOTLAND.

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day."

*FOURTH THOUSAND.*

GLASGOW:  
JAMES MACLEHOSE, 61 ST. VINCENT STREET.  
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.; ALEX. STRAHAN.  
EDINBURGH: EDMONSTON & DOUGLAS.

1865.

263.3

M22

RECEIVED  
JAN 11 1912  
LIBRARY

## P R E F A C E.

---

THE speech of which I now publish the substance, was not written, but was delivered extempore from a few brief notes indicating my line of argument. Though spoken very rapidly, it occupied three hours in its delivery. I was placed in a difficult position, having to reply to long and carefully written speeches, by my learned and excellent friends on the other side. I was thus obliged to take up the whole question, and to discuss it with regard to the state of feeling in Glasgow and in Scotland, as well as in the Presbytery, both with reference to the Sabbath, and to a tendency manifesting itself, in some quarters, to lose all faith in the Lord's-day, because losing faith in the only ground on which it had generally been put in Scotland. My sincere desire was not to destroy, but to build up; and my belief is, that what I have said will have this effect on the minds of very many who will give my words their candid consideration.

I call this pamphlet, treatise, sermon,—for it partakes of the character of all,—*the substance* of my speech, because I have had to write it; and while embodying every principle, every doctrine, every fact, every argument contained in the original speech, with every anecdote even which may, at the moment, have escaped from my tongue, I have expanded many portions of it, re-adjusted others, lengthened here, or added there, to explain more fully what I meant and mean. A great part of the latter portion was not reported in the newspapers. I am very sensible of the unartistic form in which it appears—I cannot help it now. I leave it to be fairly judged of as a whole.

Unless I had, to a large extent, anticipated the results of this discussion,—so far, at least, as they have been personal to myself,—I should not have engaged in it with such a feeling of pain, and such a solemn sense of my responsibility to God as I did.

But having been enabled to accept the duty, which I believed, and now believe more than ever, God, in His providence, had imposed on me, I accept, in perfect peace, all the consequences, however deeply painful to me, which the performance of that duty has involved.

Some of these results I much lament for the sake of others, more even than for my own. I lament the spirit in which I have been everywhere in Scotland criticized, and spoken of, and written of, by some who are opposed to me, from the pulpit, the platform, and the press. A meaning

has been given—studiedly, I fear, in some cases—to the expressions regarding the Decalogue, which my *words* might possibly be made to bear to a mind not willing to understand them; but which, even had it been true and unmistakeable, might, in charity, have been pardoned or left unnoticed, as simply bearing evidence of my insanity! Strange to say, the same words were quite understood in England, and by all who sympathized with me in Scotland. I beg those who wish to do me justice, to read the extracts from Baxter, quoted in my speech, and to remember that these were read by me, as a part of that speech, at the first meeting of Presbytery, and as expressing what I meant by the abrogation of the Decalogue; and that, though not published then, they were again read at the second meeting of the Presbytery, and thereafter published in all the Glasgow newspapers,—and then let them say, whether, with these passages as an exponent of my meaning, I have been dealt with in the spirit of fair play, or of Christian charity, by very many of my critics?

I refrain from further alluding to all that has been uttered against me. There is One who fully understands the sorrow which must be endured by those who, seeking to do His will, are yet the occasion of creating doubt in the hearts of those they love, regarding their own character, or of adding, in any case, to the most intolerable burden that can weigh down the spirit of man—that of dislike or of hate to a brother.

But I should be very ungrateful unless I acknowledged different results from these—such as the Christian treatment I received from my brethren opposed to me in the Presbytery, and from many Christian gentlemen who, whether with me or against me, have spoken from the platform, or written in the press, with justice and fairness on this subject, as well as the letters of kind sympathy and of cordial agreement in my views which have come to me, every day, from both clergy and laity of every denomination;—most of all, as might be expected, from those of my own Church. As it has been impossible for me otherwise to reply to these, I take this opportunity of thankfully acknowledging them. But I hope for results of more importance, and less personal to myself, from this discussion. One of these I pray may be, and I believe will be, a Lord's-day, in the slow, perhaps, but sure progress of Christian opinion, kept on sounder grounds, with less of the spirit of bondage, and more of the spirit of that true liberty of faith and love with which Christ has set us free—a liberty which, the more it is understood and believed, can never be used as a cloak for licentiousness.

I must, before concluding this long Preface, allude to some objections to my speech, or rather to my speaking at all on such a question, or my venturing to open it up in Scotland.

(1.) It has been urged against me that, after all, my opponents and I, though starting from different points, come at last, practically, to the same point—that of a holy keeping of the Lord's day;—why, then, it is asked, moot the speculative difference, and not be satisfied with the prac-



tical agreement? I reply, that if I and those who think with me—a vast number in the Protestant Churches in this and other countries—cordially give our brethren liberty to keep the Lord's-day in *their* way, and to spend it in such a spirit, and for such reasons, as *they* believe to be according to God's will; why should not the same liberty be extended to us? Is this a point of difference in which there is to be no *mutual* forbearance? Must *we* alone be silent, or be reviled, and our names associated with infidels, and put down as opposed to the keeping a holy day to the Lord; nay, in some extreme cases, be spoken against with as fierce a spirit as the Master was, when accused of "having a devil," because He broke the Sabbath? It is full time, I think, for such liberty being demanded, on our part, as our *right*.

(2.) "But it will give a handle to the ungodly, who will abuse and pervert the Christian liberty you speak of, and which Christians only can use aright. For the sake of the ungodly there must be a fixed *law* of the Fourth Commandment." I am not aware of any gift of God, or of any truth of God, which ungodly men have not abused and perverted since the days of the Apostle Paul, and none more than the doctrine of Christian liberty. But I am really not hopeful of the success of any effort to make the Fourth Commandment respected by ungodly men, who, in spirit or deed, break one or more of the other nine. Many, alas! who profess to reverence the Fourth, seem to have little regard for the Ninth.

(3.) "But it will give offence to many of the godly, and weaken your influence; and we know how St. Paul, while teaching Christian toleration, warns us to beware how we offend even a weak brother." As to my influence, I leave that in God's hands. All I have to do with is His truth. As to offending weak brethren, there are, I think, few things more grievously misunderstood than the principles and conduct of St. Paul with reference to weak brethren,—while in his *practice* he yielded to prejudice, he never by silence strengthened that prejudice, but ever in his *speech* protested against it. If he did not condemn the weak brother, who, esteeming certain things to be unclean, acted according to his belief, but commended him for so doing; yet, at the same time, he testified against that weak belief, and said, "*I know*, and am persuaded of the Lord, that there is nothing unclean of itself." He became, indeed, as a Jew to the Jew, complying in love with many of his old religious customs and prejudices. But why?—to lift the Jew out of the bondage of that very Judaism, and to wean him from those very customs; for in the same spirit of love he never failed, by unmistakeable, frank, and open speech, to protest against the Judaism, teaching that those customs were, in Christ, done away, and that the Jewish "principles" of his brother *were* *prejudices*. And so should it be with every Christian. Let us, in *action*, and from love, come down as far as possible to meet our weak brethren, and not cause them to offend by what we *do* in things indifferent; but from the same love, and in order to lift them up into a truer spirit, let us speak out the truth regarding the very points in which

we think them weak, and to which, on that account, they may cling with great tenacity and passion. Otherwise the fear of giving offence by our speech will degenerate into all that is mean, cowardly, and dishonest. False impressions as to our real convictions will be given by our silence. Every species of prejudice will be strengthened by those who should remove them, and a better state of things made impossible, unless it comes from without the Church, instead of from within. The weak will not only be tolerated, but govern; and the strong will not be tolerated, but, if possible, be crushed in the name of truth and of piety.

I have done;—

“That which I have done  
May He within himself make pure.”

As far as in me lies, I will not be dragged into any further controversy on this subject. I leave the battle to younger men. I have spoken in my place in the Church Court to which I have the honour to belong, and I have spoken on a single point only of religious practice. I will henceforth, as heretofore, give myself, not to this or to that point, however true, within the whole range of Christian truth or practice; but will preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified; and seek, with God's blessing, to make those whom I teach true believers in Him; and in this way only, secure obedience to all His commandments,—which verily are not grievous.

An apology is due to the reader for the length of this Preface and for its egotistical character. But, in the whole circumstances of the case, I could hardly help myself. The delay in the publication of the Speech has been occasioned partly by my unavoidable absence from home, and partly by the preparation of the Appendix. I beg to acknowledge my manifold obligations to Dr. Hessey's *Bampton Lectures*, for both argument and authorities; and also to the ample collection of the latter by Mr. Cox, in his lately published volumes on *The Literature of the Sabbath Question*.

## SUBSTANCE OF SPEECH.

---

MODERATOR,—I crave the kind indulgence of my brethren—their charitable interpretation of my words, and of the spirit in which I now address them. I rely, and I am sure not in vain, on your brotherly sympathy while I address you upon this most important topic.

Believe me, Moderator, that nothing but an overwhelming sense of duty could induce me to bring this subject before any Court of our Church. It is always a great pain to me—far greater, perhaps, than those who do not know me will give me credit for—to differ from my brethren of this Church or Presbytery, and from none more than from the friends who have now addressed you. It is a very great pain, indeed, to differ from Christian men anywhere. To suppose that I am indifferent to the opinion of my brethren—that I do not care what they think of me, or what they say of me—would be extremely false to the deepest, truest feelings of my heart. The more I love my brethren, the more I desire them to love me; the more I respect their judgment, and confide in the truth and sincerity with which they utter their opinions, the more I crave with my whole heart that they should give me the same credit. And believe me, Moderator and friends, not the fear, but the certainty of being misunderstood,—in some cases, perhaps, of being misrepresented,—of hard words being spoken against me, of hard thoughts being entertained of me by those whom I love and respect,—fills me at this moment with great pain, and I might say nervous anxiety. At the same time, sir, there are other things which I fear still more. There is an awful danger to a man from being entangled by any circumstances on earth to speak that which is false to himself, or to be silent about that which he holds true before God. There is danger, in this respect, not only from the irreligious world, but also from what is called the religious world; and danger to every Christian minister, more especially to young brethren in the ministry, from their characters or beliefs being suspected by those whom they respect and love within the Church. There are dangers from true disciples, and dangers from false disciples; dangers from Pharisees, Sadducees, and Scribes; dangers besetting us as Christian men and Christian ministers from every side, and from ourselves most of all.

None of us are free from them; and our duty, therefore, is to carry one another's burdens; to sympathize with one another; and, as we shall answer to God, to do all we can to lay no stumbling-block in the way of a brother's searching for and speaking out the truth,—nay, to help him to do so before God. We should all fear lest our eye be turned aside from the truth by influences of any kind, “orthodox” or “heterodox;” remembering our Master's solemn warning, “How can ye believe who seek honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?” There are two things to which we must ever be true—conscience within and Christ above. When these are lost, all is lost!

I regret very much, indeed, a word that escaped my respected brother, in his introductory speech—he, I daresay, from his goodness, not attaching so much weight to it as I do—when he spoke of my dragging this subject before the Court. He did not know me, or did not think, perhaps, at the moment, or he would not have spoken thus. During the eight-and-twenty years I have had the honour and privilege—an honour and privilege for which I am every day more thankful to God, and never more thankful than at this moment, when I feel the freedom with which I can address my brethren, though in a minority—I say during the eight-and-twenty years I have had the honour of being a minister of the Church of Scotland, I do not think I ever brought forward before a Church Court anything controversial, or that could possibly divide them. I have brought forward many practical questions,—not speculative ones, or questions of no practical value. You know this is true. But when others have introduced questions of a different kind, I may have had the unhappiness of opposing them. I would have you remember the peculiar circumstances in which the present distracting question has been “dragged” by me before you. I have made it a rule never to discuss questions of doctrine in public meetings. I do not blame brethren for doing so in the City Hall, or anywhere else, if such be their judgment. There are two places only where I have done so,—from the pulpit and in Church Courts. I have always preached to my own people that which I solemnly believed at the time, willing rather, in six weeks afterwards, if necessary, to confess from the pulpit that I was wrong, and mistaken in what I had said, than to be untrue at the time; and ever resolved that I should never be in that pulpit, for any consideration under heaven, as a mere telegraphic wire, to communicate that in which I did not myself believe, and with which I did not sympathize. The other place in which I have spoken, when called upon to do so, in questions of doctrine, has been in the Church Courts; and there, with whatever pain I have differed from brethren, I have always stated the opinions which I honestly held. Well, in what circumstances am I placed here? For years I have preached to my people, not your view of the Lord's-day, but another—one not based on the Sabbath law of the Decalogue, as to the origin; but based on the necessities of Christian worship, and the authority of Christ and His apostles. I came here to hear this Pastoral. Had there been nothing in it contradictory to my own



convictions; or to the teaching I have given from the pulpit, I should never have said a word on the subject. But I was placed in this position: either not to read your Pastoral,—which would, in my opinion, have been highly disrespectful to the Presbytery,—or to read that Pastoral ministerially, and say, “I read these things, but I do not believe in some of them;”—or, as my only other alternative, to come and state to the Presbytery frankly why I did not assent to these points, or acquiesce in them; and then, with that explanation, to request the Presbytery to let me be free to express my dissent from these points. These were the circumstances, sir, in which I brought forward this question the last day that we met here. Nay, further, I beg you to remember—and I do think you will give me credit for it—that though quite ready then to have addressed you, I moved an adjournment, as most of our members had gone to hear Mr. Gladstone, and I thought the question too important to be discussed at a thin meeting, and when those best acquainted with it were either not present, or not prepared to oppose me with all the might of their knowledge and convictions. The elaborate and eloquent orations we have been privileged to listen to to-day, prove how much you have gained by delay, though they add to my personal difficulties while arguing against them. Such conduct on my part, I submit, was not “dragging” the question before the Court, as if I were actuated by vanity, inconsiderate rashness, or selfish ambition.

Now, while there are points on which I differ from you, still I am thankful to say that there are many more points in your Address, and in all that has been said, in which I most heartily agree. We are all agreed in this Court, I am sure, in wishing, with simple and sincere hearts, to know the will of Jesus Christ. I should hope there is not one man here who would not, as far as he knows, die, rather than do anything he felt to be against the will of his Master. We are agreed also on another point,—that there is, and ever will be in the Church, a Lord’s-day. Nor do I think there has been anything said, so far as I could catch, either in the Address, or in what has been spoken, regarding the mode of keeping the Lord’s-day, in its right observance, in which I do not agree with you; nay, I may, in some respects, possibly go further in my estimate of our duties and privileges on that day. The points on which we disagree are the historical origin of the Lord’s-day, and the grounds on which its observance is binding upon the Christian Church. I think that your position is an inconsistent one. I think you are basing a number of duties upon the Sabbath law of the Fourth Commandment, and taking liberties with it, as contained in the Decalogue, which you have no right to do. I at once state, therefore, that I cannot, as a Christian, accept of the continued obligation of the Sabbath law of the Fourth Commandment; while, at the same time, I have perfect faith in the Lord’s-day.

But let us suppose, brethren, that we could not, in the end, agree in our views regarding the Bible “law” as to this day, while we might agree as to Christian practice on it;—that you, on the one hand, should maintain,—what, I am quite sure, you do most firmly and

earnestly believe,—that your present position is the only sure and right one; nay, even that you were persuaded that the Sabbath should fall upon the seventh day of the week; while I, on the other hand, maintained with equal sincerity and good conscience my belief that the Sabbath of the Old dispensation was abrogated, or had been lost or absorbed into something far better, because belonging to the New,—and that too upon apostolic authority;—then, even with such a difference of opinion as this, I would confidently ask if there is a single case that could conceivably occur in the Christian Church in which we might be more clearly guided in our relative duties by what the Apostle said in reference to the keeping of days in the Epistle to the Romans? If his principles, evolved from the very nature of the New dispensation, cannot apply to our case, they cannot, as far as I see, apply to any. Hear what he said, and hear it, believing, as you truly say you do, that the Fourth Commandment was then binding on Christians:—“One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.” And if any of us imagines, that because he is right in his views of this or of that day, *therefore* his brother, who differs from him on such outside details, is necessarily wrong, what said the inspired Apostle—who was “persuaded of the Lord” that there was nothing unclean of itself? Did he say, If I am right, you must be wrong, and *therefore* you must act as I command you? No; but in the charity of Christ he said, “To him who *thinketh* it is unclean, to him it is unclean.” Oh! blessed liberty of the spirit of truth, which we must strive to see and learn! I remind you of this now, dear brethren, that you may bear with my difference of opinion, as I seek to bear with yours; and that you may hear me at least with kindly feelings, though what I am about to say may probably pain you. For in thus freely speaking my mind, I am speaking in defence of at least fair Christian liberty, and demand, therefore, in Christ’s name, and under the Magna Charta of our common liberties, bestowed by Him on His Church, that you do not, in this matter, either despise or judge me, were even the day I “regard unto the Lord” different, in its origin, character, and objects, from yours.

Let me, then, proceed with my argument. Now, I admit that upon this Sabbath question nothing original can be said. I do not profess to say anything original. If I did, it would be a strong presumption that I was wrong. Our sober duty, however, is to weigh the already complete and exhaustive evidence, to judge fairly of what can be said and has been said on both sides, and to endeavour wisely to apply whatever principles we thus arrive at to the solution of the complex practical problems to which our every-day life and the present condition of the Church and of society give rise. We are bound to be persuaded in our own minds, and not because others are persuaded.

Let us, then, briefly inquire as to the nature of the Fourth Commandment. What is it? Under what obligations does it really place us, for the discharge of which we are responsible to God? As to its letter, it is clear, for example, that it authoritatively binds us to keep *the seventh day holy*.\* It is not *a seventh*—that is, in my opinion, not fair criticism. Indeed, I am not aware that this has ever been seriously questioned, except perhaps by those who, judging from their line of argument, fear that the elasticity of “*a day*” is required to make the commandment applicable to the whole world, while “*the day*” would seem to favour the conclusion to which they object, that it was for a limited portion of the globe only. Further, the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment was from evening to evening.† It began upon—what we should call—the Friday evening, and ended upon the Saturday evening. This fact is of some importance as telling on social habits. You remember, doubtless, what Michaelis makes of this, shewing the much more favourable position in which the Jew was placed in the fine climate of Palestine, as compared with the Christian, especially the poor Christian, in the cold, damp climate of Northern Europe. The Jew, he reminds us, might, for example, have his hot dinner on the Friday afternoon before the Sabbath began. In the delicious climate of Palestine he might have on the Sabbath his milk, his grapes,—all, in fact, that he could desire in hot weather; and then, when the evening of Saturday closed, he might have his hot dinner again. This, as a fact, bears very materially upon the question of breaking the Fourth Commandment, as it has been hitherto explained in Scotland, where men seriously talk of the sin of cooking a hot dinner on Sunday!

Then, consider further, the *objects* of the Fourth Commandment. The Sabbath was, no doubt, a grand witness for Jehovah as the Creator of the world, but especially for that Creator as being the very same God who had brought the children of Israel out of Egypt. It was also a blessed day of rest, and I doubt not, to the spiritually seeing Jew, was a shadow of better things to come. It is a fair question, indeed, how far the blessed rest secured by the Jewish Sabbath was at all connected with *public* worship.‡ I certainly am very much inclined to think that it was more of an end in itself than a means of attaining anything higher, beyond that of individual worship and social instruction—not necessarily by Levites—on Divine things. For let us recollect the circumstances of the country. How, for example, could there have been any *united* worship upon that day? You may force the word “*sanctify*” to mean that, though it may also mean simply “*separate*,” or “*set apart*.” But if you mean *public* worship—where could that worship have been performed, according to the Mosaic law? Synagogues did not exist for a long time after the giving of the law. The question of their origin is a difficult one. They were not Mosaic, but began probably about the time of Ezra. The convocations that are spoken of up to that time were connected with the sacrifice at the Tabernacle or Temple; for social worship was then connected so much with a place,

\* See Appendix A.

† See Appendix B.

‡ See Appendix C.



either at Gilgal, or Gibeon, or Shiloh, or in the Temple, or wherever the Ark was, that to enjoy it in Palestine every "Sabbath," as we do now in Scotland, was for ages physically and "ecclesiastically" impossible. There was of course on that, as on every other day, individual worship; but when you are running a parallel between the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment as observed by the Jews in Palestine, and the Lord's-day as enjoyed by Christians, you cannot prove that there was anything among the former corresponding to our worship in our churches.

But I beg to call your attention to the Sabbath as it has commonly been described and enforced in this country. Not content with the character of its employments as described in the commandment itself, we have habitually explained the day, by the light of all the comments in the Pentateuch and Prophets on it, as the Jewish Sabbath; and then we have said to our people, *this* is the Christian Sabbath, which is of perpetual obligation. Now, we must keep in mind that there are not two Sabbaths described in the Old dispensation;—one that was comparatively easy; and another which could not be relaxed, but was binding in jot and tittle like a *moral* law, and to the breaking of which many pains and penalties were annexed. We have one law in the Decalogue, and out of it; one law, which, if it laid men under a moral obligation to keep it at all, obliged them to keep every jot and tittle of it. There can be no trifling with it either as a moral law, or as a positive command given by God.

If this account is correct, then I dare to affirm, without fear of contradiction, that we do not practically acknowledge ourselves bound by this commandment. It is not to the point to say that we keep it in spirit. We have no right, I repeat, thus to tamper with it, or to let "one jot or tittle" of this law pass away, if it be of "perpetual obligation," until it is all, and in every point fulfilled by us. The day of the week; the hours and measure of the day; what may, and what may not be done on that day; each and every point as defined in the commandment itself, or as explained by what we assume to be its authoritative comments, must be kept. We dare not alter a letter of what has been written by God's finger on tables of stone, if what He has written is *for us*. Now, in this sense the commandment is, I allege, not kept by any of us. One Christian man only that I know of in this city—I mean Mr. Begg\*—seems to me to carry out logically the premises which have been here assumed as true, for he has kept the seventh day from evening to evening for thirty years.

We do not keep the day; and in a hundred things we do on Sunday what it would have been unlawful for the pious Jew to have done on his Sabbath.† Our servants do servile work,—light fires, make beds, clean out our rooms, cook our dinners, &c., and probably drive those to church who have carriages. This is too notorious to be insisted upon; and so, many men feel themselves to be in an inconsistent position, and try to get out of it, just like my excellent friend Dr. Macduff, who, while he holds so firmly to this Fourth Commandment, would allow to be done upon his Sabbath what would

\* See Appendix D.

† See Appendix E.



have horrified any pious Israelite of any age or time. Dr. Macduff does it because he cannot see any ill in it. He uses his own good Christian common sense, walks in the spirit—but yet, unfortunately, as I think, for my friend's consistency. I maintain that, whatever we clergy may say to the contrary, unprejudiced laymen see in our conduct a manifest inconsistency. I was very often inconsistent on this point, I admit, when I believed as you did. But should any man try to be consistent, and to keep the commandment as it has been described from the pulpit and in tracts by those who lay burdens on men's shoulders which they, perhaps, do not carry themselves—then what follows? Asceticism does. Not, however, that I am one who would despise an ascetic for conscience-sake. It is often a grand visible triumph of spirit over sense, from conviction, however erroneous. And this asceticism, or Judaism, I cannot help seeing in the old Covenanters—noble men, who, if they did not fight for the liberty of others, fought at least for their own, and have preserved the independence of our country. These men had a strength and backbone in them which was grand. They would have been chief among the tribes of Israel. I read, for instance, of James Howie of Lochgoin, who, when passing along the moor bogs, and just as he was treading on the moss, saw a broken jar full of coins, (still preserved in his family); and when some of his boys—as I suppose we should have done ourselves, even under the Fourth Commandment—rushed to possess themselves of them, the old man said, “No, don't touch them; it is the Sabbath of the Lord; pass on.” I say he was a grand Christian Jew, that. I admire him. I am not prepared to say that I should not have been tempted to secure the gold on Sunday, had it come my way; but I am sure I should have given it to the old man on Monday morning—every farthing of it—from sheer admiration of his grand self-denial.

But there have been other results than mere asceticism from the views I am comparing and combating. I think that the *tone* of teaching, in general, throughout Scotland, which has logically sprung from this view regarding the Sabbath law of the Fourth Commandment, has produced in our country a Judaical spirit, which I think is to be deplored, and ought to be kindly, but firmly exposed, in order to be changed into the true freedom of the Christian life of faith and love through God's Spirit. Look, for example, at the state of most districts in the North of Scotland where this teaching has had full and uncontrolled sway. I might, without any unkindly feeling, challenge any Free Church Minister, —and perhaps I might extend the challenge to those who, in my opinion, are still freer—to some of the Established clergy also in those districts,—whether he would dare to shave on Sunday morning, and let his people know it? Would not his influence be weakened, and his piety suspected? Take another illustration of what I mean. A friend of mine, a deacon of my church, went with a party to fish, the other summer, in one of the outer Hebrides. He was living with a good man, but an out-and-out Jew. My friend had a nice ham, a few slices of which he wished to cook for breakfast

on Sunday morning. His host did not refuse to cook the ham, for a Highland Jew, as well as a Palestine one, likes his food. So John began to slice the ham until he came to the bone, when he put down the knife and said, "I would rather not!" "Why, John?" "Because it is the Sabbath." So my deacon had to saw the bone, when John continued the cutting of the ham. I don't "despise" John at all for his scruples. He acted according to his light. I state the fact only as it illustrates the feelings and practices of thousands in the North regarding the Lord's-day;\* and only by such facts, however trifling they appear to some, can the state of feeling in a country be understood. I could give innumerable illustrations of the same sort, to shew how *hide-bound* people are by the letter. And, alas! many of the clergy themselves have become slaves, and have conscientiously forged the very chains from which they cannot now escape, even while feeling their bondage. To the best of their knowledge, I believe, and with perfect honesty, but not seeing a more excellent way, they have been so drilling their people into the Jewish Sabbath and all its Jewish details, that they are now in a position from which they can hardly emancipate themselves, without such an apparent inconsistency on their own part, and such a shaking of the faith or prejudices of their people, as they fear to encounter,—a very painful position, in which I heartily sympathize with many a brother.

But is this Judaism confined to one part of the country only? I grant that our freedom has been immensely increased. Sentiments to-day even have been uttered that no minister would have dared to have spoken a few years ago. I think we owe much of this liberty, not to the clergy, but to Christian laymen, who have not been so much bound by their position as we have been, and also to the leaders of opinion beyond our country who have unconsciously fought for us. But there is even now in Glasgow a vast deal of Judaism; while things have been done, within our memories, by clergy, magistrates, and police, in the way of interfering with others, which, thanks to public opinion, would not be tolerated now.† Yet even now, for example, some will worship with an instrument in Church, and yet will not do so in their own houses. They will train up little children to keep the Lord's-day as if they were old apostles. And in regard to walking on Sunday by those who need it for health, or for recreation,—about which I rejoice to hear the sentiments of my friend, Dr. Macduff,—I ask you, sir, whether Christian men—whether from the effects of long teaching or mere prejudice, I do not know—would not have been, a few years or even months ago, very much shocked at his sentiments? I myself having incidentally mentioned, in a speech about a North-End Park, that I thought on the Sunday evening working-men might enjoy God's fair world with their families, was publicly spoken against, and of course impeached as *exhorting* men to spend the evening in that way only, when I had an extra service in Church for them! There was a howl got up immediately for my daring to say this. But, with the exception of

\* See Appendix F

† See Appendix G.

my friend Mr. M'Gregor, who was present at that meeting, I never, until now, heard another clergyman speak out in my support. I can assure you I was horrified at such gross Judaism. It made me, I might say, almost tremble for the condition we were in in Scotland, and feel that we were standing on the edge of a slippery precipice, over which many might suddenly fall into utter disregard of the Lord's-day. It revealed a state of matters that might induce a terrific reaction as a protest against such ignorance and such cruelty; and all in the name of our Father in heaven! Only think of it! We get parks for those working-men—men who rise at five o'clock in the morning, and drudge through life during the day, and come home weary at night—and we have, hitherto, practically said to these men, in the name of the Sabbath of the Lord, “Kennel up into your wretched abodes!” Who dares deny it? For what else was I blamed, I should like to know? Against what else was the cry raised? And let Dr. Macduff beware, or he will have the cry against him too. And to put our Judaism beyond a doubt in this respect, let me remind writers of kind and sensible Pastorals, that our own General Assembly, as late as 1834—I quote second-hand—in a Pastoral addressed to our churches, declared walking on Sunday to be “an impious encroachment on one of the inalienable prerogatives of the Lord's-day.”\* That is what I call clerical Judaism. The same thing comes constantly into play. It comes in contact with the merest trifles as “an everlasting No.” Wet or dry, can we take a cab?—No. Why?—The Fourth Commandment. Dare we have a hot joint for dinner on Sunday?—No. Why?—The Fourth Commandment. Can we walk out with our children on Sunday?—No. Why?—The Fourth Commandment. Can we let young children amuse themselves in any way on Sunday?—No. Why?—The Fourth Commandment!† And so on in innumerable trifles, in a way, the reasonableness of which no man can see or feel. In this spirit have I heard a person lamenting the passing away of religion. “In my day,” he said, “we walked to the kirk on the top of the causeway, and never boo'd an e'e; and sat in the kirk and durstna tak' our e'en aff the minister; and then cam' hame; and then we were chasteessed”—he meant catechized—“chasteessed a' nicht on the carritch.” And can we, until such a state of things as this is boldly and firmly exposed and denounced by us clergy, as ignorance of the will of our gracious Father, go to the people and say, “You are to be cheerful; very cheerful on this day?” I grant you that our Pastoral expresses on the whole a different spirit; but it is difficult to discover it as a legitimate consequence of a belief in the Sabbath of the Old dispensation as of perpetual obligation. What more remarkable proof could I give of the presence and influence of this spirit with which our habits of mind are imbued, than what was said at the recent public meeting in our City Hall about Sabbath trains? A clergyman from England, of our own city,—for whose Christian character I have the highest respect,—stood up, without one single person to dissent from him, not even my friend Dr. Jamieson, who was present,

\* See Appendix H.

† See Appendix I.



and said, as a proof of how strictly he had been accustomed to keep the Sabbath, that he had never seen a hot joint of meat on Sunday till he came to Scotland; and never had been in a carriage on Sunday; and then, speaking of Sunday travelling, pronounced the judgment, that any man who travelled on a railway on the Lord's-day could not have in him the love of Christ! What Sabbath-breaking could be so bad as the utterance of such a sentiment? And this is just one of the dangers of enslaving people to the letter, instead of leading them up to a spirit and life in Christ; that we get a style of religion which strains at gnats, and swallows camels; which tithes mint, anise, and cummin, and omits the weightier matters of the law—judgment, mercy, and faith; and which has a constant tendency to substitute outward forms, shibboleths, phrases, even tones of voice and peculiarities of manner, for the genuine life which is in and by Jesus Christ,—yea, alas! in many cases, the hate of the old Pharisees at the alleged breaking of an outward rule, for that Christian love which is the fulfilling of the law. With unfeigned sorrow, God knows, I utter this; and greater sorrow must I, or any man, endure, who will dare expose it, though with no other wish than to lead brethren to a truer and nobler position.

It strikes me, again, that this same "Scottish Sabbath" of ours is, in some respects, more rigid than even the Sabbath of the Pharisees in our Lord's time. Let me illustrate what I mean. When the late Lord Palmerston was here, I had the honour of being asked, with others, by the Lord Provost of the day, to meet him at dinner on Sunday. A most excellent lady, whom I very much love and respect, came to me in great anxiety afterwards, saying, "I have to ask you one question: Did you dine with Lord Palmerston on Sunday?" I said, "No, my friend, I did not." "I am so thankful to hear it," she replied; "I was sure, however, you would not have done so." I said, "Pray do not mistake my principles. That evening happened to be one for my preaching to the working-classes, and I thought it would be, to say the least of it, in wretchedly bad taste if I gave up my lecture even to meet so agreeable and distinguished a person as Lord Palmerston; but otherwise I would have gone with pleasure and a good conscience. Remember," I added, "that our Lord dined with a Pharisee on Sabbath."

DR. JAMIESON—Was it on Sabbath?

DR. MACLEOD—I have never heard it doubted.

DR. JAMIESON—I rather think not. It was after sunset on the Sabbath.

DR. MACLEOD—Well, it was after sunset I was asked to dine with Lord Palmerston! My friend exclaimed, "Oh, surely not!" "Saint Luke mentions it," I said; "yet do not infer from this that we are all to have dinner-parties on Sunday. We must obey the spirit, not the letter."

Without illustrating my position further, it does humbly appear to me, that our attempting to combine the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath law with the Christian liberty of the Lord's-day,—to impress men, on the one hand, with the strictness of the letter, instead



of lifting them up into the spirit of obedient love, and then, ever and anon, to relax that letter when convenient—produces confusion and doubt. Men are wavering between a rule and a spirit,—sometimes following the one, sometimes the other; hardly knowing, or guessing in darkness, what God's will is. I am quite sure, also, that very many are induced to do many things which, although quite innocent, they have yet been taught to believe are wrong, and that morality is thus weakened. Things which God hath cleansed are called unclean. Heavy burdens are laid on weak and uninformed consciences which God has removed; and all this tends to weaken the authority of conscience, and the reverence due to it in regard to what is moral law, or eternal right and wrong. An excellent elder of another church in Glasgow once asked me, "Did you preach in your church that a man might, if he pleased, walk on Sunday?" I said, "Yes, I did; and I confess it to the whole world." "Well," he said, "I am thankful for it. I always walked,—but I went out at the back-door." As another example, I was told by an English barrister, that on one of the English circuits, when a very stringent assize discourse had been preached on the breach of the Sabbath as a great source of crime, the presiding judge remarked to the preacher, that he quite agreed with him, but on very different grounds from those adduced in his discourse, inasmuch as, in his own experience, he traced the beginning of much crime to the fact of the young being trained up in the habit of doing many things on Sunday which they believed to be sins, though in themselves quite allowable, in forgetfulness of what the Apostle says, "When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child." These illustrations may be sneered at as unbecoming levity and mere trifles; but they shew how the wind has been steadily blowing; and every man can add to them evidences of the same breeze—sometimes a gale—from his own observation.

Another result of our teaching is not without danger, especially to our people when abroad, who have not learned the real spirit in which the Lord's-day should be kept; and that is, the idea of a Scottish Sabbath being, as it were, an institution peculiar to Scotland, and sacred only within her borders, and to be kept on grounds that are not suited to every country under heaven. For myself, I have never seen any reason for keeping the Lord's-day when abroad, differently from what I do when at home. But, I regret to say, this has not been my experience of many Scotchmen who have, in Scotland, held rigidly to the Sabbath law,—a fact which, if it were necessary, I might illustrate by notable examples. I have never yet met abroad that minister or man who did not, even after preaching a sermon, take a walk—a sober, pleasant walk; in Switzerland, for instance, to enjoy its scenery; or on ship-board, for hours on the deck, enjoying society and the sea. I never met a countryman in Jerusalem, or Moscow, or anywhere else, who did not do so; and yet, in an Edinburgh Presbytery—recollect, in the nineteenth century—a most respected and intelligent clergyman, a few years ago, expressed his amazement at the state of religion in Stras-

burg, because, when he called with a letter of introduction on a clergyman, he found him—doing what? Dancing, or drunk?—No; but walking on the ramparts on Sunday! Once more, suppose I were to open schools in Glasgow on the Sunday morning, for wretched outcasts,—boys who work to support their widowed mothers from seven in the morning till eight at night; who cannot get education unless the pale-faced creatures sit half-asleep at a desk after their heavy work is done, to learn to read and write until nine or ten,—a torment which you and I would never think of inflicting upon our own boys and girls,—were I to take these creatures, playing in the kennel; going about the streets, and perhaps tempted to steal; growing up in ignorance of all religious truth, and the means of attaining or communicating it by reading or writing; and if, *along with religion*, I were to teach them these branches, adding the comforts of a warm fire, and possibly some food,—are there not hundreds who, believing they did God a service, would protest equally against the children learning to read or write as against their “playing” on Sunday, and denounce me as a dangerous revolutionist, who wished to destroy the day of holy rest and worship? If not, a marvellous revolution has come over us! Well, Dr. Thomson, Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Guthrie, preached for such schools, and I have had the honour of doing the same, at Stockport,—and we did right in this. But how many would be disposed to think, “Oh! that was only the Sabbath on the other side of the Tweed!” Is there no temptation, therefore, I ask, from this constant talk about a Scottish Sabbath, to make men think that what might be very wrong in Glasgow, is quite innocent, or even right, in London or Paris? Is there no danger here?

The conclusion to which I have been forced to come is, that the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment is not binding upon the Christian Church. The answer to this is,—that it must be so, because it is contained in the Decalogue, and that the Decalogue is the moral law, and as such is necessarily of perpetual obligation. This might be conclusive if no distinction could be made between the Decalogue and the moral law, and both were identical. But this assumption, if carefully considered, might involve serious difficulties when endeavouring to reconcile the change of any portion whatever, and on any authority whatever, of a *moral* law, and one, consequently, of perpetual obligation. The more you describe the circumstances in which the Decalogue was given and received, in order to impress its binding character upon men, the more solemn awe you cast around the “Ten Words,”—the more puzzling must it appear how any one of these words could, in any degree, or to any extent, be modified by changing the day or anything else, unless by an authority as undoubted as that by which it was at first promulgated. But on the supposition that there is a real distinction between the moral law as contained in the Decalogue, and the Decalogue itself as a covenant between God and Israel, no such difficulty will be felt; but harmony only perceived between the authority of the Old and New, and in our duty in relation to every portion of God’s revealed will. We can easily understand such a distinction as

this in the case of a marriage contract, which might impose, under heavy penalties, certain duties on a husband, such as, to protect, shelter, and support his wife,—never to strike her, never to starve her, never to desert her, &c. These very same duties, while binding on the husband *because in the contract*, would be felt to be binding on him also because he was a man, not a brute—a Christian, not a heathen; and would remain in full force were the contract abrogated which contained them. Now, it does seem to me that such a distinction as I have alluded to is recognized in Scripture. The Decalogue, or the Ten Words, was the sum and substance—the essence, so to speak—of the “covenant” which God made with Israel. Hence it is said, “And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words *I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel*. And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water: and *He wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the Ten Commandments*.” Hence, also, these tables are called, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, “the tables of the covenant;” and the chest which contained them, is named “the ark of the covenant.” This supposition sufficiently accounts for the fact, that there are in the Decalogue, viewed as the “words of the covenant,” allusions peculiar to the past history and future prospects of the people with whom that covenant was made: such, for example, as, “I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage,”—a blessed deliverance indeed, but which does not apply to us as Gentiles.\* I was never brought out of Egypt, nor out of bondage, for I am not of the Jews according to the flesh; nor am I, like the member of a “caste,” virtually descended from them, for I am born of God. In like manner, the promise annexed to the Fifth Commandment is local and temporal.†

DR. JAMIESON—It is repeated in the Gospel.

DR. MACLEOD—Yes, it is, indeed, quoted in the Epistles as the first commandment with promise; and this shews its importance for all time. But the promise itself is one which, from its very nature, cannot be literally fulfilled to us, but is evidently local and temporal. There are also many Christian duties which might, without due consideration, *seem* to be based on Old Testament commands, when there is yet no connection between them, except that of some inner abiding truth,—as, for example, when the duty of supporting the ministry is, by the Apostle, enforced by “the law,” “*For*,” he says, “it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn.” But is this the “law,” therefore, of the Christian Church for the support of the clergy?

Now, it is the Decalogue, viewed in this aspect, as written on “the tables of the covenant,” and including necessarily its Sabbath law as the sign of the covenant, which I presume to think has been abrogated by being nailed to Christ’s cross,‡ with the

\* See Appendix K.

† See Appendix L.

‡ See Appendix M.



whole Mosaic economy, and buried in the grave with Jesus. Hence, as the Apostle says, with reference to this whole "covenant," including, consequently, the law of the Sabbath, "Blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross; and, having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." But the moral law, on the other hand, obviously rests on a totally different basis from the "ten words" of the "covenant." Its precepts, as moral duties, are binding on us, because they are true and right in themselves; and they are not true and right because they are in the Decalogue, but they are in the Decalogue because they are true and right. All moral law is, moreover, discoverable by the moral nature of man, so that Gentiles who have not "the law," as written on tables of stone by the finger of God for the Jews, have, nevertheless, the same law, in so far as it is moral, written on their spirits by the finger of the same God. Surely on this ground we may affirm, without doubt or offence, that the law of the Fourth Commandment, from its very nature, is not moral. To worship God, and to set apart a fixed time for that worship, may indeed, with some truth, be called moral; but, to say the least of it, it is doubtful whether even the duty of worship can be found in the Fourth Commandment, though possibly it may be inferred from it; for it must be admitted that there is not one hint in it about worship, but only of sanctifying the day, or of setting it apart for rest. And in regard to what really is contained in it—even though rest were a moral duty, because a physical and social necessity, yet a command to rest on the seventh day, with children, cattle, strangers, &c., is obviously not a *moral* law, but a positive enactment, binding only on those to whom it is given. To abrogate a positive command by competent authority, is possible; but to abrogate a moral law, is impossible by any authority whatever. The Sabbath may be abrogated, and the covenant of which it was a sign; but who can abrogate a moral duty, or make right and wrong exchange places? The Decalogue, as a marriage contract, may pass away; but Decalogue or no Decalogue, every commandment in it, in so far as it is moral, must be of as perpetual obligation as the law of *duty* to God and man.

I therefore do not believe in the continued obligation of the Fourth Commandment.

But should we come to the conclusion, that the Decalogue, as God's covenant with Israel, has been abrogated, while we, as Christians, have still to do with it as an expression of moral law in the true sense of the term, the practical question remains, What use are *we* to make of it? and how do we stand related to it? For example,—is this, we ask, "the law" by which all of us must now reach, or by which any of us have ever reached, a knowledge of sin? If any man who has never known or realized the evil in his own



heart; its fearful corruption, and the results and evidence of this in thought, word, and deed; his want of love to God and man; his dire opposition to God's holy will; his base selfishness, pride, and unbelief; his hatred, malice, and uncharitableness; his unprofitableness as a servant; his abuse of his talents; and most of all, that which is very sin itself, and of which the Spirit specially convinces us,—the not believing in Jesus, and the consequent unlikeness to Him;—if such a man, I say, is to be taught to know what he is, and to feel his evil condition by seeing his guilt in a broken law, whither, for this end, are we to send him? To Exodus, or to the Gospels and Epistles? To Sinai and the Decalogue, or to Calvary and Christ? Which will most enlighten and convince the conscience? Let the experiment be made by any earnest man. For myself, I should be ashamed not to declare before the world, that one intelligent look, by faith, of the holy and loving Christ, would crush me to the dust with a sense of sin, which the Decalogue, heard even from Sinai, could never produce. Never by the Ten Commandments could I be so convinced and humbled, even when perceiving their spirituality, as I should be in seeing *law*, or God's holy will, expressed in what Christ *was* and *was not*.

Must I go to the Decalogue for justification? No Christian asserts this. Jesus is my justifier. I am justified by faith. He is the end of the law for righteousness to all who believe.

Must I go, then, to the Decalogue for a rule of life? Am I obliged, by any moral necessity, to pass by the teaching of the Apostles on every duty, with all that is described by them as life in the flesh and in the spirit?—and must I go to the Decalogue, saying, There is no rule full enough and spiritual enough for me in Apostolic teaching, so I must find it here? Must I pass also Jesus Christ and His life as a revelation of duty, and His laws as its expression, and say, there is no rule sufficiently explicit, searching, and directing, revealed for me even in Him?—and must I travel upward until I search the Decalogue to find rules of life clearer, fuller, and more able to guide me than all I have left behind? If any man means to assert this, or anything like this, or anything approaching to this, then I can only say, that I cannot understand him! Christ's life is itself a sufficient rule;—in Him all God's moral law, as a rule of life, is summarily comprehended. If men must have it evolved into principles of conduct expressed in words, they will find it in such as these:—"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even unto them; for this is the Law and the Prophets." "Love is the fulfilling of the law." "All the law is fulfilled in one point, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." If we wish a fuller exposition of the law of duty to God and man, we shall find it in the Sermon on the Mount, and in all the Gospels and Epistles. If this will not suffice, I fear the Ten Commandments will prove still more insufficient; and that conscience, as the last resort, and the reflection of the moral law, will not be more clear or full. To go from Christ, then, to the "law" for a rule of life, would be to me like going from the sun at noon-day to the moon at night, for

light to guide me on my journey. It does not seem to me to be true Gospel teaching, to send me first from Moses to Christ for pardon and grace, and then to send me back again to Moses for a rule of life. Moses was the servant, Christ alone is the Master. In the presence of Moses and Elias, God said, "This is my beloved Son; hear Him!"

But after all, what is "the rule of life" to a believer? Is it a series of *rules*? No, it is life itself; it is that which is the true life of the soul; the right condition of the spirit toward God and man, out of which all right thought, right feeling, right action, must come; that life which is derived from, and sustained by Christ. And what is that? What but love to God and man. All rules are but channels cut out by our wise and gracious Master, along which the water of this divine life in the spirit *ought* to flow, and *will* flow.

To the believer Christ is all in all. Through Christ he finds peace with God, being reconciled to Him by His atoning death, and, receiving the adoption of sons through His Spirit, he cries with the spirit of freedom and of love shed abroad in his heart, "Father!" He abides through faith in Christ, and as a disciple, is *disciplined* to "learn Christ;"—and to put off the old man, with his affections and lusts, and to be renewed *in the spirit of his mind*; and to put on the new man, which, after God, is renewed in righteousness and true holiness. In one sense the Christian is above law as mere rule; inasmuch as he walks according to "the spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus;" and as he has received the Lord Jesus, "so he walks *in Him*," "rooted and built up *in Him*." He can say, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live; yet, not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life I live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." To such a man, as living in the Spirit and following Jesus, it would make no possible *practical* difference if he never saw the Ten Commandments. Let us beware, then, of giving them a place which the Lord alone and His Spirit should occupy. But "do we then make void the law? God forbid! Yea, we establish the law." "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

If you ask me, then, to keep the Sabbath law, you must prove to me, as being under law to Christ, that I am to keep it as contained in the law of life which is in Christ, or as sanctioned or enacted by the Master. What precept, what duty imposed on me as a Christian, do I fail to find in Christ, that I must go back to an earlier stage of His kingdom and government in order to find it? Where, then, is His authority for keeping the Sabbath law of the Fourth Commandment after His resurrection? In vain I ask! It has died out with the old economy. The Passover has gone, without even formal abrogation, and we have the Lord's Supper; circumcision has died out, and we have baptism; the Sabbath has died out, and we have the Lord's-day. So, too, Jerusalem has died out, and we have the worship everywhere in spirit and in truth. Palestine has vanished as the Holy Land, and we have the world

as our field, and the hope that the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of the Lord. A religion of mere rules, forms, and outward restraints has been lost in a religion of holy principles, working in freedom to the sure result of holy practice, perfect peace, and exceeding joy. The Sabbath has sunk gradually beneath the horizon, as His worship and the first day of the week have risen with himself from the grave; while high above all times and seasons, all days, weeks, months, and years, rises Jesus Christ himself as my life,—its source, its expression, its end, its all and in all!

But let us turn once more to the Decalogue, whether as a covenant with Israel, or as an epitome of moral duties, and see how it looks to us in the light of Christ. We Christians not only know that the Lord our God is the Creator of the heavens and of the earth, but we know also—what no man of God living under the Old dispensation ever dreamt of—that the eternal Son of God was that Creator; “For all things were made by Him and for Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made.” Though we have never been brought out of the land of Egypt, nor out of the house of bondage, we have yet been redeemed by the precious blood of Jesus, and delivered from the bondage of guilt and of sin, and have become the servants of Him, our Redeemer. We not only know the folly of worshipping dumb idols, but we know the glory and blessedness of worshipping Jesus Christ as our Lord and God. We do not, verily, take the name of the Lord our God in vain; but we know His name as it was never known before, and rejoice in it as that of our Father in Heaven, the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour, whose name is Love. If we are free from any obligation to keep the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, we nevertheless enjoy the substance of which that was the shadow;—we enjoy Christ; and by ceasing from our own works and believing in Him, we enter into His rest in God; and we enjoy the spiritual rest of commemorating Him, and of worshipping, with the whole Catholic Church, on the day of His resurrection; and thus link the law of the Old with the life and privileges of the New covenant. We honour our father and our mother; but these holy words have, to us, a meaning higher than the pious Jew could understand, when we see them in the light of a Divine Father and a Divine Son, and of that Son as born of woman, and as having been subject to His parents. “Thou shalt not kill,” is in Christ lifted up to the loving of my brother; as Christ, the Brother of us all, has loved me, and has taught me so to love my brother as to give my life for him, if needs be. In Jesus Christ I see my body as the temple of the Holy Ghost, which if any man defile, him will God destroy; and I see Jesus as the Lord of the body; and I see His sister as my sister, whom I am bound to respect and honour; and I see marriage elevated in Christ on the ground that we are members of *His* body, of His flesh, and of His bones. As a believer in the Lord, it is not enough that I do not steal, but that I labour with my own hands in the thing that is good, so that I may give to him that needeth; and that my brother’s goods be as secure with me



as with him, because I love him as myself. It is not enough that I do not bear false witness against my neighbour, but that I love and cherish his character and name as I do my own, because we are members one of another. In Christ, covetousness is an idolatry which shuts men out of the kingdom of God—while all the children of the kingdom rejoice to give themselves and all they have to the Lord. I do not deny that there are harmonies between the letter even of the Old, and the spirit of the New covenant, more varied and deep than we can discover, until we sing that song of Moses and the Lamb, in which they will ultimately blend. But here we can see a glory in the New that never was in the Old. “If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth. For if that which was done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious!”

[At this stage of the debate the Presbytery, having to preside at an ordination, unavoidably adjourned. On their meeting again DR. MACLEOD resumed his speech.]

In resuming this debate, Moderator, I need not occupy your time by going over the ground already traversed. But let me read to you one or two passages from this volume of Richard Baxter’s, which contains a treatise with which I have long been familiar, on the divine appointment of the Lord’s-day,\* not as proving, but as expressing the views on the Decalogue which I have endeavoured to state, and with an authority which none of us, I suppose, profess to have.

“Moses’s law never bound any to it but the Jews, and those proselytes that made themselves inhabitants of their land, or voluntarily subjected themselves to their policy. For Moses was ruler of none but the Jews, nor a legislator or deputed officer from God to any other nation. *The Decalogue was but part of the Jewish law, if you consider it not as it is written in nature, but in tables of stone; and the Jewish law was given as a law to no other people but to them.* It was a national law, as they were a peculiar people and holy nation. So that even in Moses’s days it bound no other nations of the world. Therefore it needed not any abrogation to the Gentiles, but a declaration that it did not bind them. *The whole law of Moses, formally as such, is ceased or abrogated by Christ.* . . . . . *Object.* ‘This is the doctrine of the Antinomians, that the law is abrogated, even the moral law.’—*Answ.* It is the doctrine of the true Antinomians that we are under no Divine law, neither of nature nor of Christ; but it is the doctrine of Paul and all Christians, that the Jewish Mosaic law, as such,

\* *The Divine Appointment of the Lord’s-day Proved.* Baxter’s Practical Works, vol. xiii., pp. 417-420. Lond. 1830.

is abolished. *Object.* 'But do not all divines say that the moral law is of perpetual obligation?'—*Answ.* Yes; because it is God's law of nature, and also the law of Christ. *Object.* 'But do not most say that the Decalogue written in stone, is the moral law, and of perpetual obligation?'—*Answ.* Yes; for by the word *moral* they mean *natural*, and so take *moral*, not in the large sense as it signifieth a law '*de moribus*,' as all laws are whatsoever, but in a narrower sense, as signifying, that which by nature is of universal and perpetual obligation. So that they mean not that it is perpetual as it is Moses's law, and written in stone formally, but as it is moral, that is natural; and they mean that materially the Decalogue containeth the same law which is the law of nature, and therefore is materially still in force: but they still except certain points and circumstances in it, as the prefatory reason, 'I am the Lord that brought thee out of the land of Egypt,' &c. And especially this of the seventh-day Sabbath. . . . . The law of Christ bindeth us not to the observation of the seventh-day Sabbath. Proved. *Because it is proved that Christ abrogated Moses's law, as such*; and it is nowhere proved that He re-assumed this as a part of His own law. For it is no part of the law of nature (as is proved), which we confess now to be part of His law."

Before leaving the negative side of my argument, and passing to the consideration of the institution of the Lord's-day, I must advert to several arguments which have been adduced in support of the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath law of the Fourth Commandment. One of these is founded on the alleged fact, that the Sabbath was a primeval institution, appointed by God for Adam in Paradise. Now, if my learned friends attempt to prove, that for several reasons—amongst others, the necessities of man's spiritual nature, and the goodness of God in ever revealing what man required to know for his present and eternal well-being—it is highly probable that the human race, in the earliest ages, may have had holy times, seasons—probably even every seventh day—consecrated to Divine worship, I should not be disposed to challenge their opinion. But when, not contented with such an admission, my friends are determined to build upon the theory of a primeval Sabbath the immense superstructure of the perpetual obligation of the same Sabbath on *all* men, *because* represented in Adam, I am compelled, however briefly, to examine this argument. Many of our greatest thinkers and best commentators have been unable to find any evidence for this primeval Sabbath.\* The argument for it is founded almost exclusively upon the reasons assigned for keeping the Sabbath contained in the commandment itself: "For in six days," &c., "*wherefore*," &c. It is admitted that God revealed to *Moses* the facts connected with the creation of the world 2700 years after its creation; and amongst these facts, this one, of His working six days, and resting on the seventh. But is it as certain that this fact was revealed to *Adam*? I can see no proof of this. Then, again, it is by no means so very certain, as it is assumed by many to be, that the purpose of sanctifying the seventh day, grounded on the rest after creation, was actually *carried into*

\* See Appendix N.

effect from the beginning of time—any more than, as Bishop Bramhall has remarked, that the purpose of God regarding the Apostle Paul was carried into effect until many long years after, though he was consecrated to God from his mother's womb. You have therefore to suppose Moses, as the inspired historian, revealing, *for the first time*, the fact of the six days' work of God, and of the seventh day rest, and adding—"wherefore God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." But blessed it when? In Paradise, 2700 years before, or now in the wilderness, at this moment in the history of His Church? I agree with Paley in his argument: I do not think it an unfair one. But if it is not conclusive, far less are those on the opposite side: and any argument would require to be very firm indeed, in order to bear all that is laid upon this one.

The support which my friends attempt to give to the primeval Sabbath from the septennial division of time, is not convincing. No person knows better than Dr. Jamieson how the septennial division of time—one, too, by no means universal—has been otherwise accounted for. He knows very well how some writers on this subject have asserted that it arose from the natural divisions of the lunar month, and others, from the seven planets, observed from the earliest times.

Nor is it easy to account for the marked silence of 2700 years as to this primeval institution; nor or its neglect, necessarily, by the slaves of Israel in Egypt for centuries, without a word said as to its suspension.

But with all this *doubt* regarding a primeval Sabbath, as instituted by God himself, what would my learned friends make of the fact if proved? They insist on establishing nothing less than this:—that a law, supposed to be given to Adam while in his unfallen state, and under the covenant of works, without sin or sorrow, without bodily or mental weakness, or fatigue of any kind, without sickness or death, not even while earning his bread in the sweat of his brow; that a law given to such an one, in such circumstances, being given to Adam as man's representative, was of perpetual obligation upon the whole human race, Jew and Gentile, Barbarian and Scythian, bond and free; upon men degraded, sinful, and subject to every infirmity; on men, who, if heathen, never heard of it; and who, if Christian, were under the covenant of grace! I will not trust myself to say what I think of such arguments and conclusions, should they be a hundred times stronger than they are. It seems to me, if I may dare to say so, that the only analogy in this respect between Adam and his descendants is the only one practically ignored—that whereas Adam, without labour or fatigue, could walk in an earthly Paradise on the Sabbath, his wearied children have been hitherto forbidden to walk even in a City Park.

What has been said by my reverend friend regarding the falling of the manna as a proof of an earlier Sabbath, was very ingenious, though he wisely did not pin his own faith to it. It has, as he well knows, received a different, and, in my opinion, a more probable inter-



pretation.\* It has been asked, whether, when the manna fell on the sixth day in a very large quantity, and the people could not make out the reason, but were all astonished and perplexed, they would have been so if the Sabbath had been familiar to them? But Moses tells them the reason for this gift from heaven: "To-morrow," he says, "is the Sabbath,"—as though he had said, "To-morrow is the day God hath set apart as a holy festival, and therefore learn, for the first time, that this provision has been made for it." I am astonished that so much has been made of the word "remember,"† as if it necessarily applied to past time, rather than to present attention. The very fact of the Sabbath law being a positive command, and not a *moral* law written on the conscience, made it the more necessary to have attention called to it. Besides, it is notorious, that the same emphatic word "remember," is, in the original, used in regard to the Passover, which was admittedly a new institution; and in several portions of Scripture, where attention is directed, not to the past at all, but only to the future.

As to the arguments from the prophetic writings about the continuance of a Sabbath, Dr. Jamieson passed them over, feeling their weakness; and Dr. Macduff, I think, alluded to them but slightly. These passages prove too much. Reference was made to the 66th of Isaiah, and the 17th and 23rd chapters of Jeremiah. I think it is not possible to read these without seeing that they would prove new moons as well as Sabbaths to continue till Gospel times. They are clearly declarations made to the Jews, and to the Jews only. I believe in their spirit—namely, that as long as the Church exists on earth, there must be public worship. But they teach me no more. Then, again, I think you introduced into your Pastoral the passage supposed to refer to the Sabbath rest in Hebrews.

DR. M'TAGGART—It was merely an allusion to the reading in the margin, "the keeping of a Sabbath."

DR. MACLEOD—Well, I believe you will not differ from me when I say that that interpretation is given up. Dr. Lindsay Alexander, in his *Life of Wardlaw*,—who, in his Sabbath treatise, adopted Owen's criticism,—has given it up. It refers obviously not to the rest of creation, nor to the rest of Canaan, but to a higher rest in God, which they who believe in Jesus enter into.

Another argument in proof of the same position has been adduced from the fact that the Sabbath, according to Christ's prediction, should continue after His death, when He said, "Pray that your flight be not in winter, neither on the Sabbath-day."‡ But His warning only assumed the fact, that the Jewish Christians would keep their Sabbath until the destruction of the Temple. We know that the Christians fled to Pella from Jerusalem when the Temple was about to be destroyed. In His compassion and mercy, He therefore says, "Pray that it be not in the winter." How thoughtful that was! Pray that it be in a good season. Pray that it be not on the Sabbath, for He knew that that Jewish institution would then exist; and that this being so,

\* See Appendix O.

† See Appendix P.

‡ See Appendix Q.

the contingency was a matter of immense importance to them. We know that the Jews, while they resisted, always refused to attack the enemy on the Sabbath. What was the consequence?—the Romans took advantage of that day to arrange all their troops and battering-rams quietly and peaceably under their very walls, for the attack next day. No Jewish Christian, seeking to flee from Jerusalem at that time, could have carried a burden; nor have been permitted to leave the town with it. It was tantamount to his losing his life, therefore, to have attempted to fly from Jerusalem on the Sabbath. Then, again, it has been strongly urged that the phrase, “The Sabbath was made for man,” proves it to have been for man *as* man, or for humanity.\* I think it is a gift of God to man, but that this text does not prove it to be so. It is remarkable that such accurate divines as my friends should misquote Scripture, for there is no such verse in the Bible. It is but half a verse. It is like the quotation, “Judas went out and hanged himself: go thou and do likewise.” These may be *words* of Scripture, but you are not to put them together; as little should you separate those which are united. Had a drowning man a bag of gold about him, and did the practical question arise, whether he should save his gold or his life? it might be said, in such a case, either “the gold was made for man,” so you must keep it and lose your life; or, “the gold was made for man, not man for the gold,” and so lose the gold, but save your life. The text is, “The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath;” and it proves, it strikes me, the very reverse of what our respected friends and others allege it does. It proves, that when the claims of the Sabbath in any respect come into conflict with the claims of man as man, the Sabbath must yield. The institution was made for man—for man’s good, and not man for the institution. This is not what would be said of any part of the moral law, which cannot mould itself to man, but demands that man should mould his character and ways to its obligations. Lastly, the fact that our Lord himself always kept the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment, proves only what no one calls in question, that, “being born under the law,” He fulfilled all righteousness. The New dispensation did not commence until after His death and resurrection.

I am, therefore, not convinced that the Sabbath law, as revealed in the Fourth Commandment, is binding on Christians, yet I cordially admit that it was a gift from God;—that it was a witness for great facts in the history of the world and of the Church; that it consecrated labour and rest to God; and that we might expect that, *in some way or other*, its blessings would be rescued from the ruins of the Mosaical economy, and be reproduced in a still more free and beautiful form, in harmony with the spirit of the new economy. We shall not, therefore, be surprised to find that the Lord’s-day is in harmony with the old Sabbath, and has, under God, grown up within the bosom of the Christian Church.

But I must approach the positive part of my argument.

\* See Appendix R.

Now, suppose we assume that the Sabbath law, as an ordinance which belonged entirely to another economy, has passed away, having done its noble work on the earth, and been an immense blessing to the Church of God in its infancy. What then? I can well understand how many Christians should at first, and for a moment, feel alarmed at the conclusion, and exclaim, "Do not take it from us; explain it in any way you please, to adapt it to the times; but do not take it from us." Why? "Because if we let it go, we have no Sunday." Were it removed, they are disposed to say, as Mary said at the empty sepulchre of Christ, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him." Yet, as she got something better than the old human form, when she found her risen Lord, so I hope we shall also get, in Christ, a day better than the Sabbath. How well I remember this feeling myself, when, a long time ago, I preached a course of sermons on the Sabbath, following most sincerely the very line of argument you have been pleased to follow to-day, and most heartily believing in it, as you most heartily believe in it now. I do not mean to allege whether I have advanced or gone back—I pass no judgment in this respect on myself or upon you; but while I preached according to my belief, I felt myself constantly met by difficulties which I could not answer. I felt in this way: "I believe as far as I see; I cannot disbelieve it; but I am not satisfied, and perhaps never can be." Profoundly I felt, that if the old Sabbath law was given up, I did not know what to lay hold of. The very passionate manner in which men cling to it, often springs from nothing else than their passionate love to a holy day consecrated to the Lord. There is in the bosom of the Church a deep and undying conviction as to the blessedness of such a day, as being essential for the existence of the Church, and part and parcel of its history; and so long as Christians remain on earth, they will and shall have a holy day in seven. And most acutely do I feel the pain which I fear my argument must give to many humble and holy souls, at whose feet I am not worthy to sit, when it seems to them to lead necessarily to the conclusion, that it must end in my giving up, or inducing others to give up, that day which is to us so unspeakably precious.

The argument *must* be wrong which *necessarily* leads to such a conclusion. Let them believe, at least, that I would mourn such a result as much as any man on earth, and let them in charity assume that my sincere belief before God is, that the arguments by which some men would, with most perfect honesty, and with more ability than I pretend to, establish this day on the perpetual obligation of the Fourth Commandment, are insufficient, and therefore destructive in the end of what we all love. If I, therefore, seem to destroy, it is only in order to build up. I may, of course, be mistaken. If so, I have faith in God that He will in mercy destroy my work. But if it is good, He will protect it, whatever men may do or say to the contrary. Let me, then, endeavour to shew you the grounds on which I think the Lord's-day may be established as an ordinance, which cannot



but command the approval of every Christian man, or of any man, indeed, who has any respect for God, or any sense of his own responsibility.

In doing so, let me, in the first place, remind you, that there is a fact essential to Christianity, and that is, the existence of a Church. There is an absolute necessity, as a part of our Christianity, for Christians to meet together for worship, and to remember Christ at the Lord's Supper,—an ordinance given us as a symbol of our fellowship, not only with Christ, but with one another, expressed and strengthened by our eating the one bread and drinking the one cup. Christ has established such a Church on earth, and His will is not fulfilled by one who only professes, "I believe in Christ; I stand related to Christ;" but refuses to unite himself, as a member of the Church, with those who profess, and, as far as he can judge, actually possess, the same living faith. "Him that is weak *in the faith* receive ye," says the Apostle; thus intimating that faith, which alone unites us to Christ, should unite us to one another. Thus believers should, as a society, meet in their corporate capacity for instruction, for worship, and for partaking of the communion; nay, did the present circumstances of society admit of it in every case, not only to assemble themselves together, but also to consider *one another*, and to provoke to love and good works. This is as much a part of practical Christianity as anything revealed by Christ. The whole social system of the Gospel is a protest against the individual man shrinking up within himself, or remaining alone, saying, "I believe in Christ, that is enough." The Christian, by his very faith and obedience to Christ, dare not do this if he would; and I am sure he would not if he had that love to his brethren which necessarily springs out of love to the Father and Elder Brother. The brotherhood of the Church is rooted in its relationship to the Eternal Son. I maintain, therefore, that if a Christian went to a distant part of the world, —to India, or anywhere else,—he ought to find out other believers, if no Church already existed in the place, and to worship along with them on Sunday, remembering the promise, "Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Nay, more, they would meet together to remember Christ at the Lord's Supper, even where there was no ordained minister of the Gospel to dispense it. For am I to be told that Christians, thus meeting in the distant wilderness, are never to remember Jesus Christ till some clergyman comes amongst them; that they have no liberty to constitute themselves into a church for a time; and that if, *in such peculiar circumstances*, they said, in the presence of God, "We recognize this bread and wine no longer as ordinary food, but partake of it in remembrance of Christ,"—this would not be recognized as a holy sacrament? I cannot deny this without going into the Popish idea of the Eucharist, as *necessarily* requiring the consecration of the priest. But for the sake of order,—believing, as I heartily do, in a Christian ministry as the *rule*, and in government of some kind as necessary for every

society as distinct from a mob,—such cases are exceptional. But I allude to them as bearing out the great idea of what I might call—if you will pardon the expression—the socialism of Christianity. And I have illustrated, by an extreme case, the importance which I humbly think is attached to the social Christian fellowship of the Church. But if what I have alleged regarding our duty on the Lord's-day, would hold true, even where there was no organized branch of Christ's Catholic Church, how much more binding is the duty in a Christian country !

But supposing that this first duty is granted,—which, remember, I base on *the revealed will of Christ*, and the very existence and necessity of a Christian Church,—I further affirm, that the duty and privilege of such Christian fellowship in holy worship, necessarily involves the appointment of *some fixed day* for the performance of such Christian duties, and for the enjoyment of such Christian privileges. This does not require any proof.

Now I find such a day, as a matter of fact, in existence. I am born into it. I never made it ; but I awake and find myself, as a baptized man and a Christian, in the light and glory of a day of rest and worship. I do not at present speak of this or that day of the week, or of *the* day, whether it be the seventh or the first, but of *a* day in each week, which, as a fact, is set apart, in the providence of God, for the social worship of the Christian Church. Now, the fact is a most marvellous one, and one the importance of which can hardly be exaggerated, that *a* day is consecrated wherever the name of Christ is known and Christianity professed, for the worship of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Once a-week the sun, during twenty-four hours, sheds its light on Christian congregations in prayer throughout the whole earth. And let me here ask, in passing, whether any Christian objects to such a holy day as this? Can he, dare he, do so? Is it possible for him to allege that the Christian Church either need not, or ought not thus to consecrate *any* day of the week? And if one professing Christian were found capable of saying this, is it conceivable that the Christian Church will ever agree with him, and alter the usage of eighteen centuries?

But that we may more fully appreciate the singular blessings of *a* day such as that which, whatever be its origin, we now, as a fact, possess; let me, for the sake of others—because I speak to and for others without, more than to or for those within this house—glance at some of the benefits of this day.

It is, first of all, adapted to our whole wants as men and as Christians,—adapted to our wants physically.\* The great mass of men require rest from labour. I do not allege that any physical law makes one day in seven necessary, but I am quite sure that this proportion of rest to hard-wrought men is a felt blessing, and is adapted to their wants. I will give an illustration of this. Some years ago, for certain reasons, I went upon a private expedition to Paris, furnished with letters not easily got, to investigate into the state of the working-classes, and some of those co-

\* See Appendix S.

operative societies which had begun in the time of the Republic. In the course of my inquiry it was necessary to come in contact with many of the Socialists in Paris. I met them in their workshops, and I found a body of men the most intellectual and most intelligent I almost ever met in my life,—men who had utterly broken away from Romanism, but who were more religious in their feelings than most in that city. They believed in a God, in a right and wrong, and in a future state, and led comparatively moral lives. To these men I said, “Well, what is your rule in regard to Sunday work?” The reply was, “We once worked upon it as on other days.” “How did you find that succeed?” I asked. “Not at all; very badly: we found at the end of the month that we had not turned out more work; and that it was best to rest on Sunday.” I said to my friend, a Protestant clergyman, who was with me, “I had rather have that testimony from these men, than whole tons of pamphlets by Sabbath Alliances; those might be written with an unconscious bias, but with these men it is not so.” And you all know that infidel France, after having banished the day of rest, restored it as a necessity.

Consider, further, this day in *its social aspect*. What a fearful breaking up this busy commercial life is of social ties! Think of the separation among members of the same family: the merchant going off in the morning, working all day, and returning in the evening to dinner, hardly meeting with his family at all. No person blames him for this: it is a necessity—a duty; yet it is socially a loss. He is hardly able to meet his friends in a quiet way, or—so busy is he—to visit that old lonely gentleman or gentlewoman, or even sick relation; or to cultivate much intimacy with his dear children, far less to visit the poor and needy. But this day enables him to do this. He can cultivate all those sweet, tender, affections round the fireside, with wife, children, and friend, and keep up a delightful intercourse with Christian acquaintances. The importance of such a day in this respect to the working-classes it is hardly possible to exaggerate. Here is the father of a family, who, in the morning, in pitch darkness, leaves his house at five or six o’clock,—leaves all his little children in bed, takes a hurried meal, has hardly time to speak to any one at home, and trudges, amidst the clanging of bells, or long before they begin to sound, to a distant part of the town. There you see him in the afternoon, sitting, perhaps on a cold stone, taking his meal that is carried to him in a tin can by some little child. He does not see his family at his meals. He may, indeed, be supplied at one of those noble refreshment rooms of Mr. Corbet’s,—and what a blessing they are to the town!—but there is no family life there! At night he returns home, but the children he left in bed he finds in bed. He sits at his fireside; but there is no sweet and pleasant intercourse between the wearied man and wife or child. He hardly knows them. The children, even if not in bed, have probably been out working, and have come back wearied and sleepy. The wife has been toiling all day, and is now busy getting a little



supper for her husband. And then the night and oblivion come, and in the morning they rise to pursue again the same routine of labour. Unless these men meet their families on the Lord's-day, and cultivate family affection, I know not what will become of our population. This is the chief reason why you find, with noble exceptions, indeed, so many parents who prosecute their children for aliment;—and find instances of children taking their food at one end of the room, and their mother taking hers at the other. There is a want of that intercourse by which the children shall know and love their parents, and the parents their children. Now, this one day in the week is admirably suited to meet those wants; while there is also time given upon it to visit this sick neighbour, or that old acquaintance; and to cultivate friendly intercourse between man and man.

I might dwell also upon its *intellectual* advantages, as affording opportunity of culture to the mind; and I have no hesitation in saying that, while much has been rightly attributed to the power of our schools, in giving an educational training to our working-classes, far too little has been said about the training of our pulpits. I hold that this has been, perhaps, the most powerful training of all. Some critics, who do not know us, affect to ridicule the argumentative and logical sermons that are preached to the people of Scotland by the Presbyterian clergy; but our people, in former days, at least, understood these sermons, and grappled with their arguments. This was at once a religious and an intellectual training. It may be so now, and often is, as much as in any former age. And, besides, this is almost the only day which men working hard during six days can command for reading. And when we remember the stores of rich intellectual thought and varied information which are placed within the reach of the working-classes, and which even the most scrupulous on the point of "Sunday reading" would not forbid them upon this day, we are more and more impressed with its adaptation to the intellectual wants of man.

But there is another end attained by this day, and that is, the scope which it affords for our active powers in a moral direction. There are an immense number of duties which Christian people ought to discharge to the poor, the needy, and ignorant, that we have no time for during the week. And this activity in the "doing good unto all men as we have opportunity, especially unto them who are of the household of faith," is a true rest for the affections. Rest is thus often but a change of labour; and the Sunday affords a noble opportunity for such activity. Yet, how selfishly is it neglected! How poorly is the noble privilege enjoyed!

But I have hardly alluded to the highest of all ends of this day—its *spiritual* advantages. Nothing has been said by any of my respected brethren on this point with which I do not sympathize most deeply. I pray God for the time when I shall see our wishes more realized. What would become of us if we had not its worship and teaching? All men have to be reminded, that "Man doth

not live by bread alone;" but needs the Bread of Life; and must be dealt with as an immortal being; and be led into the peace and blessedness of his Father's home. How is it possible to estimate the moral value, to man, of such a day as we now possess in each week!—a day when all that can quicken the conscience, purify the affections, and elevate the spirit of immortal man, is brought before him in the word read and preached;—when he is taught all that can guide, strengthen, and comfort him in duty, in temptation, and in sorrow;—when true light is cast on this life, and on that which is to come;—when, in one word, *Jesus Christ* as the light, revealing God and man and all things, as the very eternal life of the soul, the all in all, is preached to sinful men, and is remembered by all who know and love Him, while united worship from glad hearts ascends by Him to the throne of God. The very silence of the day is a sermon of rest, in *Jesus*, for all who are weary and heavy laden.

"Oh sweeter than the marriage feast,  
'Tis sweeter far to me,  
To walk together to the kirk  
With a goodly company:  
  
To walk together to the kirk,  
And there together pray,  
While each to his great Father bends—  
Old men, and babes, and loving friends,  
And youths and maidens gay."

We have thus, you see, to deal with actual facts. The Christian Church demands, from its very nature and the conditions of its existence, a day for social worship, and for the social feast of the Lord's Supper. Such a day now exists, whatever be its origin. This day, moreover, is also marvellously adapted to meet all our wants as men and immortal beings. This being admitted, I might here again pause in my argument, and ask those who demand a reason for retaining this day, on what grounds they would abrogate it if they could? They are not responsible in any degree for having established such a remarkable day as this in the world's history,—one so rich in blessings; but they *are* responsible for attempting to destroy it, and must be ready to give a reason for this faith which is in them,—that no such day should be kept on earth. To those, therefore, who ask, Why keep it up?—I ask, with confidence, in reply, Who would dare to put it down?

But not only have we such a day as I have described, but we have emphatically *the first day of the week*, being the day of our Lord's resurrection, consecrated as *the day* for all those noble ends. Let us glance at the evidence for this. It is a fact, that the first day of the week has been set apart by the whole Christian Church, up to the days of the Apostles, as a day of worship,—a holy day unto the Lord. Moreover, for three or four centuries before we reach apostolic times, a constant and uniform testimony is borne by all the Fathers, and corroborated by heathen testimony, that Christians met for worship, and for partaking of the sacraments, on the first day of the week, *because* on that day *Jesus* rose from the dead; while *not one* of the Fathers, in a single instance, connects this sacred day

with the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment; and others protest against the Sabbath, while vindicating "the Lord's-day." But when we examine the teaching of the Apostles themselves, and read the history of the early Church, its institutions and practices, what do we find? We find the first day of the week greatly honoured by Jesus Christ after He rose from the dead, but never the Sabbath in which He lay in the grave. We find the early Christians everywhere meeting for worship, mutual instruction, and Christian intercourse, on the first day of the week, but never, if Gentile Christians, on the Sabbath. We find St. Paul assuming, everywhere, the existence of social worship on the Lord's-day, but never mentioning the Sabbath, except to protest against its being imposed on Gentiles. And when all this is taken in connection with the glorious objects which are gained by *a* day, I can come to no other conclusion than that *this* day is sanctioned by the Apostles, inspired by the Spirit of God, and under the authority of Jesus Christ. It is not that the day *itself* is holy, but the great ends and objects which are secured by the day are so. These sanctify the day. And what other day could be selected by our Lord with more will and wisdom for the good of His Church than the day of His resurrection? The Sabbath witnessed for creation, but the Lord's-day alone witnesses for Jesus Christ, for His death, His resurrection, and for himself alive for evermore,—our resurrection and our life. The Sabbath on which Christ lay in the tomb ended the Mosaic economy. The first day of the week began the New. The one ended a week of six days work with a dead Christ; the other, with a living Christ, began a week,—a week in which I am every day to labour in Christ's Spirit and for His glory. And thus I thankfully acknowledge the day to be divine, and of perpetual obligation. I bless God also for the old Sabbath, which, though it has passed away as a command of perpetual obligation, has yet left such undying traces of its existence in the history of the Christian Church.\*

So much, however, has been said already by my friends on the other side as to the proofs, from apostolic history, of the first day of the week having been kept as a day of worship, that I need not recapitulate them. For I can adopt every argument, and accept of every fact, adduced in favour of this part of their case. The only difference between us here being, that whereas they adduce all those facts, in apostolic history, to prove that the seventh day has been changed, by Divine authority, into the first of the week, while the Sabbath law or *Institution* remains the same as in the Old economy; I, on the other hand, adduce the very same facts to prove that Jesus and His apostles have sanctioned a different day, to be kept from higher motives, and in a higher spirit than the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. To quote the language of Calvin: "In this way we get quit of the trifling of the false prophets, who, in later times, instilled Jewish ideas into the people, alleging that nothing was abrogated but what was ceremonial in the Commandment, (this

\* See Appendix T.



they term, in their language, the taxation of the seventh day,) while the moral part remains,—viz., the observance of one day in seven. But this is nothing else than to insult the Jews, by changing the day, and yet mentally attributing to it the same sanctity; thus retaining the same typical distinction of days as had place among the Jews. And, of a truth, we see what profit they have made by such a doctrine. Those who cling to their constitutions go thrice as far as the Jews, in the gross and carnal superstition of Sabbatism; so that the rebukes which we read in Isaiah, (Isaiah i. 13; viii. 13,) apply as much to those of the present day, as to those to whom the prophet addressed them. We must be careful, however, to observe the general doctrine—viz., in order that religion may neither be lost nor languish among us, we must diligently attend on our religious assemblies, and duly avail ourselves of those external aids which tend to promote the worship of God.” \*

But this leads me to consider a little further what has been said by preceding speakers regarding the Lord's-day being the old Sabbath revived.† Believing, as I do, that it is an original institution, connected as much, but not more, with the Mosaic Sabbath as the Lord's Supper is connected with the Passover, or Baptism with Circumcision, but each standing on its own independent basis—I confess that I see no authority whatever, not a vestige, for what is described as being a “change of the day, but not of the law.” I find, indeed, that Jews worshipped on the seventh, and Jewish and Gentile Christians on the first,—the one on the grounds mentioned in the Decalogue, the other to commemorate the Resurrection. I find, along with this, such language, as that already alluded to, used by the Apostle in the Epistles to Galatians and Romans—language which, in my opinion, it would have been utterly impossible for him to have used had the Sabbath been obligatory on Christians. I do not find, moreover, that the Jerusalem Church, in its first great Pastoral, imposed any such day upon the Gentiles, nor ever even mentioned the Ten Commandments; nor can I discover one syllable in all the Epistles and all the Pastorals of the apostles against the sin of Sabbath-breaking, or about the special duties to be performed on the Sabbath, or anything whatever to indicate that they held the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment,—a most unaccountable fact for those who not only believe that the Fourth Commandment is contained in the Moral Law, but seem to believe that all the Moral Law is contained in the Fourth Commandment, such a prominent place do they give it in the circle of duty! Nay, more, such an alleged change cannot be reconciled with the very nature of the case, or the circumstances of the early Church. Theoretically, no doubt, the Sabbath was abrogated, or ceased to exist as a law to Christians, on the morning when Christ rose from the dead. But God, in His infinite mercy, not putting new wine into old bottles, allowed the institution gradually to die out, or pass into something much better, when the Church was

\* Calvin's *Institutes*, II., chap. viii. § 34.

† See Appendix U.

in the transition state betwixt His death and the destruction of the Temple. During these forty years, both the Jewish and the Gentile Christians met on the first day of the week,—the Gentiles never having had the Sabbath of the seventh day imposed upon them. But the Jewish Christians kept their old worship upon the Saturday, and kept it for forty years after our Lord's death; during which period, indeed, it remained still a part of the civil law of Palestine. We find St. Paul, accordingly, complying, as a Jewish citizen, with many Jewish customs, and meeting the Jews in every way possible for him, without compromising his own freedom as a Christian. But whenever the Jews dared to tyrannize over the Gentiles, and to impose upon the many one duty or ceremony which they did not receive from Christ and His Spirit, he instantly defended the Gentile against the Jew; so that the great battle fought by him for the Gentile Church against all ceremonies, all laws of Moses, as distinct from Jesus Christ as all in all, was to gain the freedom of the Church for ever, and to make it Catholic, and not Mosaic, for Jew and Gentile as one,—not in Moses, but in Christ. He could, therefore, as it were, say to the Jews, "You and I may keep our Sabbath if we please, for we are Jews by birth; but let these Gentiles alone, and force not them to worship on our day, in our forms, and with our ceremonies. They worship with us to remember Jesus on the first day; it is enough. Let no one judge them in respect to the Sabbath." Thus, for nearly half a century, Jews and Gentile Christians met together, *on the first day of the week*, to commemorate the one grand event on which their salvation depended—Christ's Resurrection; and *some* Christian Jews worshipped on the seventh, as of old. Now, can you or any man believe it possible, if this liberty on the part of the Gentiles continued during the existence of the Temple, that so soon as it was destroyed, the Jew could say to his brother Gentile, "Brother, for years you have had liberty to keep the first day of the week, simply as a commemoration of Christ's death and for the Lord's Supper, but were never forced to keep our Jewish Sabbath; now, however, that Jerusalem is in ruins, you must worship as we do, and keep the Lord's-day on the authority of the Fourth Commandment, and for the reasons stated in our law! The thing is inconceivable—much more so when the Gentile knew that, as a Gentile, "the law" had never been promulgated to him, and that by so much less did he require to be bound by it; that he had now found Christ, who did not send him back to Moses for anything necessary for salvation, but was Himself all sufficient for principle and precept.

Now, Moderator, you may perhaps say, "What would be the application of these principles?" I might reply, that I have nothing to do with their application or consequences. If the principles are good, they will produce good consequences. My belief is, however, that I shall find it much easier to apply my principles honestly to the actual state of society, than you will, when attempting honestly to apply your rule of the Sabbath law. You open wider the back-door of "necessity and mercy" than I think the

Sabbath, as the "moral law," will admit of. "Necessity," of course, is easy, for it has no law; if it must be, it must be. And "mercy" may be interpreted to mean anything by a man who has a *rule* only, not a *principle* to guide him. But I rely on a principle, not on a mere rule.

Let me illustrate the application of my principle. If Christians, for example, believe it to be their duty and privilege to worship God in spirit and in truth on the Lord's-day, and either to partake of the communion, or at least to profess that spirit of fellowship with Jesus which is expressed in communion,—then they will, for this reason, as well as every other springing out of their wants as human beings and as Christians, *rest* on that day, and specially *in order* to worship. They *cannot*, because they will not, as a rule, spend the day in labour, far less in idle, foolish, dissipating recreation. It must, from the nature of the case, be spent *in harmony* with the tone and spirit of this or any other day set apart for holy social worship by those who love their Father and Brother; while, also, on the broad principle of Christian love, they will, though strong themselves in faith towards God, yet forego much they might otherwise do for the good and well-being of others who may be weak, and even superstitious. We have thus, in addition to all that is pleasing and edifying in public worship, the Christian conscience as a security for the right keeping of the Lord's-day. We have a further security in the loving, wise, and tender discipline of the Church,—equally removed, on the one hand, from the meddling of the detective, or the tyranny of clerical power; and on the other, from the disorder which would make a congregation a mere mob, and leave a society without any law to save it from confusion. Beyond this, and among very many who might not worship with us, we have the security of that justice, and respect for the opinion and prejudices of others, much more for their religious convictions, which characterizes the intelligent members of a Christian society. We have, moreover, that protection which a Christian Government and its laws gives to its subjects, by which, *as much as possible*, they are set free from labour on the Lord's-day, and thus enabled to worship according to their conscience, but yet with liberty to act as they please, *short* of interfering with the rights of their fellow-subjects. Therefore, if we can, by God's help, and with all our grand moral and Gospel appliances, imbue society with a *right spirit*, we have every security that reasonable men can seek for the preservation of the Lord's-day as holy and blessed. As for those who *are* Christians, we know that even if the State were against us, and tried to put down the Lord's-day, we would suffer persecution rather than give it up, knowing that we would thereby be practically giving up the visible Church of Christ. Christians and the Lord's-day must, therefore, exist as long as the world lasts, or perish together. If these principles fail you, where will you find better security for our retaining a holy day? If neither the holy Christian exercises of the Lord's-day, nor the example of the Christian Church, nor the wants of man as an



immortal being, nor the authority of Jesus and His apostles, can bind men, does any man, in his sober senses, believe that the Sabbath law of the Fourth Commandment will succeed, were it even as binding as are those moral and religious considerations which I have mentioned? If the flood of selfishness, ignorance, worldliness, vanity, and self-indulgence, can sweep away the Lord's-day, as explained, even by me, do you believe that the Sabbath, as explained by you will stem it? Will anything in the mere authority of the Old covenant be a safeguard against what has destroyed the authority and the moral influences of the New? This, verily, is not my opinion of the Christian people, nor of the power of the pulpit, in Scotland or anywhere else. To believe it would make me despair of Christianity! And all this alarm, too, in a country in which, in every parish, fast-days are kept as strictly as the Lord's-day, or even a Jewish Sabbath, and on no higher authority than the kirk-session!

Do you ask me to apply my principle more in detail, and to such practical questions as those of cabs and trains? In all such cases I should be guided by this consideration—Have the men who are employed, time on the Lord's-day to meet for worship? If not, can such time be obtained for them in the present exigencies of society? And the rule certainly should be to obtain, in every case, a day of rest; because all men who labour require rest for the body, and in this Christian country they all ought, as a rule, to have an opportunity for worship first, and along with it all the blessings which can be enjoyed on the Lord's-day. But when we ask *peddling* questions as to whether it is lawful in itself to ride on horseback, to walk five or ten miles, to take a cab, to laugh or talk about this or that, to read this book or that, we get into the confusion of minute Talmudical rules, and must fall back on the common sense, right spirit, and manly principle of Christians. Thus, because it is said in the Fourth Commandment that animals should rest on the Sabbath, is that any reason why well-fed horses, suffering from plethora in the stable, and a coachman with little to do any day in the week, should not drive out on a Sunday, provided it does not interfere with the other duties or privileges of the day? Then, as to using cabs: every man must feel, that as far as these poor hard-wrought men and horses are concerned, they should be treated with the greatest tenderness and consideration. We must endeavour to get them such a day of rest as will enable them to enjoy a day of worship in spirit and truth. With them, as with our domestic servants, "day about" might at least be the rule. But if employers refuse some such liberty to their servants, they act unlovingly, and therefore unchristianly. With cabmen, as with all we employ, we should take heed how we deny them the privileges which we ourselves enjoy as Christians. But both cabmen, and *all* men, are liable to have their Sunday rest sacrificed for a more general good. Mercy to the many, must often involve suffering of some sort to the few. Hence, when a cabman once came home with me after preaching, he said, "Really we are very ill used." I said, "Who—you, your horse, or I? because we

have been all three working to-day. I have had, the whole of this winter, three sermons every Sunday,—one being for working-men,—besides having to meet a class for the young, with hardly one day of rest which I can command during the week; and as I am thus obliged to sacrifice my ease, and my comfort, and my rest, and my family, for a public good, you must, perhaps, have this to sacrifice also.” On this ground I would seek to act, not from an abstract horror of riding in a cab on Sunday,—which is simple nonsense,—but on the ground that the Sunday is a day set apart for rest and worship; and that, therefore, men ought to be enabled, when possible, to have rest from labour, to enjoy worship, if they please to do so.

On the same Christian intelligible principle I would act in regard to railway travelling on Sunday,—a subject of the very gravest importance. As to excursion trains, my principle would exclude them; but considering that the Jews had not only fifty-two Sabbaths in their fine climate, but thirty joyous festivals throughout the year, our working-classes are sorely tempted, when deprived of holidays, to make the Lord’s-day one,—and would be still more so if they were tyrannically hindered from enjoying our parks and gardens by any extreme and selfish, and so-called “religious” faction, lay or clerical. But a day of social worship, and for the cultivation chiefly of men’s highest and spiritual good, must preclude the idea of thoughtful and considerate Christians spending it in mere recreation like this—to the country by steamers and excursion trains—more especially when, by so doing, they must unnecessarily compel others to sacrifice their best blessings to their selfish enjoyment. But as to a train, morning and evening, along our great lines of thoroughfare,—which does not needlessly deprive the employed of their fair measure of rest, and of their Lord’s-day worship,—not only do I not object to it, but I cannot see how railway directors can rightly avoid having one. I do not speak of goods trains, unless they are proved to be necessary, which I cannot think possible; but I speak of passenger trains. Suppose, for example, that a limited liability company became possessed, by Act of Parliament, of all the roads in Scotland. We will suppose their dividends to be derived from the tolls, and that Dr. Gibson—and let me say that I admire him for his bold, honest advocacy of his opinions—was chairman, or any other man firmly and conscientiously opposed, as he is, to travelling on Sunday; and that the directors and the company were to resolve, that on the ground of travellers using vehicles on that day being contrary to the Fourth Commandment as a moral law of perpetual and universal obligation, they would lock all the toll-bars;—then I, for one, would join in having them—the gates—knocked down, as preventing what was lawful, and being a tyranny worse than Sabbath-breaking. And so in regard to a railway. To me it is not an arrangement which ought possibly to be permitted, but one which seems, in the present state of society, to be almost a necessity for matters of police and of government, and for matters of good, as well as for the sake of mercy, and of good in very many ways; and that you ought not to compare

the necessities of the little land of Palestine,—hardly more extensive than between this and Perth,—with its simple peasantry, its little intercourse and petty commerce; with those of a country and state of society like ours, and far less go back to the beginning of the world to determine our Sunday duties in Glasgow from any Sabbath institution given to unfallen man in Eden! I take the liberty of saying, however, that I think the chairman of the North British Railway committed a great mistake, and put the running of a train on the wrong ground, when he made it a mere matter of pounds, shillings, and pence. Out of respect to the general religious feelings of the most sober-minded in our country, not to speak of the fair and righteous claims of the men employed, far less of higher considerations, the arrangement should have been made an exceptional one, and upon the broad ground of justice to the community and the merciful necessity of keeping open a communication between great centres of population, which can be done by public conveyances only. I could, therefore, on my principles, go to the directors and respectfully say, “I do not object to a morning and evening train; but I do seriously object, that for the sake of mere pay, and without a strong necessity, you should prevent large bodies of men from worshipping God.” I would appeal to them on the ground of sympathy with their fellow-men, whether they should not, by an outlay of money, or by additional servants, secure to those men what we secure to our servants in our own houses? Let them charge more, if necessary, to the public if this arrangement costs more; but their duty is, and so is ours, to do all in our power to give those employed by us rest for worship; and let me add, to give horses rest for the sake of the mercy due to the wearied brute creation. But when we have thus secured, as far as possible, a Lord’s-day rest for worship and communion on the Lord’s-day, then each man must follow his own conscience as to how he spends the day. I agree with all that has been said so well in the Pastoral on this point. I detest that little petty meddling of one man with another, and gossiping inquiries whether he does this or that, with everything like ecclesiastical espionage, which every intelligent Christian man in these days will rise and protest against. I would give every man his full liberty, as answerable to God, until his liberty infringed upon the liberty of others, and if a church member, until it was contrary to the recognized morals of the Christian Church. These are my principles applied regarding this question. Once more: you will say, perhaps, that we will thus come to the English Sabbath, or the Continental Sabbath. The fact is, that the Lord’s-day in England is, as a whole, marvellously well kept, but neither better nor worse than in our own city. As to the Continent, I am tolerably well acquainted with most parts of it; and I lament the manner in which Sunday is generally kept in it. But why fear a Continental Sabbath in our country, unless as a reaction from extreme teaching; more especially when its habits have never taken possession of England since the days of the Book of Sports, though the country is so much nearer the



Continent than ours, and the home of tens of thousands of Jews and foreigners? Why compare the state of feeling in Roman Catholic countries, and in other countries that should know better, where no Gospel is either preached or believed, with a country like ours, where, in all its truth, Christ's Gospel is preached by ministers of every Church, and believed and read by tens of thousands of our people? It is surely, I repeat it, a fearful confession to make, and almost a libel on our ministers and people, to express alarm lest, if the claims of the first day of the week are urged for it as being the Lord's-day, apart from the authority of the old Sabbath law, all public worship would cease and our communion tables become empty, and, instead of this, theatres and dancing saloons be filled, and our rest destroyed by excursionists? I, for one, will never give the impression that we have no solid ground, no sufficient reasons for keeping the Lord's-day holy, except on the ground of the perpetual obligation of the law of the Fourth Commandment. I have more faith than this in the Lord Jesus, and in the power of His resurrection, and in the blessedness of His day, as recognized by every one who believes in His name.

But I cannot conclude this long speech without saying that there is a more excellent way, by which we may come at a right keeping of the Lord's-day, than that of mere speeches or pastorals about it. It seems to me we are beginning at the wrong end with this Sabbath controversy. We are going forth to the people, saying, "Do not do this or that; but keep the Sabbath with cheerfulness and reverence." But how, in their present condition, can you expect a response to this from the mass of the population of whom so many complain, and whose indifference to the Sunday they fear? for the clergy are not complaining of the ladies and gentlemen—although, I daresay, if we knew all about them, these would need a little stirring up too as to Sunday duties. Attention is directed chiefly, if not solely, to the working-classes. Now, we clergymen know what hundreds and thousands of most admirable Christian men there are amongst the working-classes. But as to the multitudes who crowd our lanes and courts, or group in idleness on our streets, and never think of ever entering a church door, I ask you, in the name of Him who made them, on what grounds can they, in their present state of ignorance, be expected to keep the Lord's-day? Thousands of them do not know what you mean by the Lord's-day, or by the resurrection of Christ: they have not been instructed in the most simple facts of Christianity. Now, I wish to know what is doing by us—the Established Church—at this moment in order so to imbue them with the knowledge of Christ that we shall need laws beyond their own convictions to make them rejoice on the Lord's-day? Without the knowledge of Christ as their own Saviour, as their resurrection and life, how can they keep the Lord's-day or rejoice in it? When, some years ago, we spoke here against the Sunday steamers, with the patronage of which, even for the sake of the working-classes themselves, I had no sympathy, while yet, wishing to deal reasonably and tenderly with their supporters, I

threw out, as now, the same idea, that we should begin at the root of the evil by a more vigorous Home Mission. Some of those men, who took it into their heads I was defending Sabbath steamers *versus* churches, waited on me. I said, "Men, you are utterly wrong; but come next Sunday to my church, and I will preach to you what I know and believe on the duties and privileges of the Lord's-day." They did come. What was the result? Did my views make them more indifferent to the Lord's-day? I shall give one illustration of the practical effect of my teaching:—A man's wife afterwards came to me, and said, "I hope my husband will not lose his seat, because he came to hear you with very loose views of religion,"—I think she said he was a Deist,—“but when you preached he said there was no reasonable man could object to that. He began family worship; and instead of spending his Sundays, as he used to do, in a steamer, he was never absent from the church one day after that.”

What we need, is to inform old and young, in this city of Glasgow, as to the duties and privileges of Christians; to instruct the masses, not with right views of the Lord's-day only, but first of all, and most of all, with right views of the Lord himself, and His relationship to them.

To accomplish this, I think we require for large cities and populous districts in Scotland, not what are called, in the ecclesiastical sense of the word, *Churches*; but mission-houses, built, however, like churches, commodious and comely; not having necessarily an ordained minister and kirk-session, but with a preacher of the Gospel, under the government of the parish minister and his session, and having the sacraments regularly dispensed in them by the parish minister. These churches I would call Sessional Churches, as we call our congregational schools Sessional Schools.\* But what, as a Church, have we done, during the last thirty years, for the poor in the East of Glasgow? Let me not misrepresent my dear Church of Scotland. We have opened many Chapels, closed in 1843, and which are now well attended. We have built several churches in the South and *West*, where they were much needed; and our liberal Christian merchants have both built and endowed the Park and Sandyford churches,—one good result of which has been, that we have, as members of Presbytery, our much-respected and valued friends, Dr. Macduff and Mr. Charteris. In the East, too, we have a Memorial Church, now in the course of erection by the Messrs. Baird, which will be endowed also by them. I rejoice to acknowledge such marks of love by the members of the Established Church. But most heartily and thankfully recognizing this, I have yet very humbly and respectfully to remind you, that we have yet done little, almost nothing, in comparison with what we could and should have done, and, with God's help, may yet do, for a city whose population is increasing at the rate

\* I must refer to the Appendix for what I said in my speech, and for much more than I could say, on what I think is of some interest to fellow-labourers in this Home Mission field. (See Appendix V.)

of one thousand—a large congregation!—every month. Since the church-building era, we have built in the whole city, east of the Crescents, but two churches—the Havannah and my Mission Church; and sold two, St. Thomas's and Duke Street chapels. And I therefore repeat it, that if we are warranted in hoping that our masses will sanctify the Lord's-day, we can only do so when we provide for them the means of instruction, by which they shall know what it means; who the Lord is; and why every man on whom it dawns should rejoice in the Lord as his resurrection and life—who gives to all who believe His own rest in God. We have failed, brethren, in doing this. Think not I presume to arrogate any praise to myself as having done more than my brethren in this respect. I dare not, and could not say so at any time, least of all in the presence of even the framer of this Pastoral,—not to speak of others here present,—one of the most faithful and laborious ministers in Glasgow; whom, as a worker, I would be proud to imitate and follow. But Home Missions in Glasgow admit of no delay. Other churches are doing a part in this blessed work; we must do ours, or all we talk about will pass, as it ought to do, for mere talk, as an easy orthodox way of advocating the Sabbath as a doctrine, but not the difficult way of getting it kept as a holy duty and blessed privilege. With this discussion we should incorporate a new era in Home Mission work. Any one of us, I am sure, would undertake, for every £4000 we get, to secure a Church free from debt, holding 900 people, and also a small endowment for a Missionary, and such an organization as would secure the Christian instruction of one soul, every year while it lasted, for every pound subscribed. Liverpool, I hear, has given £20,000 for such an object. If a few towns in America gave, the other day, nearly £100,000 for a mission to the South, why should not our thousands of members and our wealthy merchants help us, as they have never yet done, but I believe may yet be induced to do, without our begging it from door to door, but offering to us money for Sessional Churches for the working-classes?

I do not here speak of the great Sunday School organization of Glasgow, which, along with the City Mission, is unquestionably one of the most important and blessed that exists. Our army of teachers is the most powerful Home Mission we possess, and requires only to be constantly recruited, carefully organized, and wisely governed, so as to work with increasing vigour.

Again, as another suggestion for bringing about a truer observance of the Lord's-day, it seems to me that all our clergy have too much to do, not only with secular business on week-days, which other persons could do as well, or better, but in the preaching on Sundays, in which they might be aided. It seems to be assumed by many in large cities, that a clergyman is needed for every meeting, for every object that can possibly occupy the public mind, even those which are called "secular!" Meetings of all sorts,—soirees, lectures, charities, until one fancies the most commonplace good cannot be done without a "meeting," which must be addressed by a clergyman. On Sunday he must preach, of course, twice, and often



thrice. The people who attend his ministry would not accept less. They must have several Sunday meetings and sermons by their own pastor; and if *they* are edified and comforted, what signifies though thousands, who never spoke to a clergyman, are left in ignorance! The clergy should have more time given to them on week days, and specially on Sundays, personally to evangelize the masses, and become acquainted with those who are outside of all churches, and of Christianity itself. The more experienced—the more cultivated—the higher the social position of a clergyman is, the more is he suited to obtain a patient and respectful hearing, and to do good among the masses, if he has good sense, good feeling, and sound views of the Gospel of good-will to man, in his heart as well as on his lips. The actual Home Mission work—that of bringing the lost prodigals into Christ's fold—is too much left to a few city missionaries: good, sincere, young men, let it be admitted, but wanting experience, and necessarily under no ecclesiastical government. Such missionaries as these, working always in connection with kirk-sessions, would form noble aids to the clergy. I know not what we should do without them; but they never can be adequate substitutes for the educated and experienced clergy, or verily we are unworthy of our position and calling in this city. Now, the Lord's-day is the one grand day for mission work among the people, when the men of the working-classes can be met with in their own houses, or have time to receive in peace the visit of a Christian clergyman, and to converse with him; but as things are now, it is the only day we clergy can do nothing for them when alone they can be found, and the day on which, as far as visiting them is concerned, even the excellent city missionaries must do least. We must have more time and freedom, I repeat, on the Sunday, and many more efficient labourers, to work systematically under us on the Sunday, if we would help men to love the Sunday who at present know nothing about its nature, and who, if they have any feeling about it as a sacred day, associate it with ennui, dissipation, or dislike. These suggestions could be more easily carried out in Glasgow than in most cities; for while, in such a large community, there must, of course, be found some exceptions, yet there are a vast majority of clergy, of all denominations, who, with firm and intelligent convictions on points on which differences are allowable, have as firm, strong convictions, far more real, on those vital points of eternal truth in which we all agree, and who have much influence, and could combine for a wider, more united, and better Home Mission.

Time does not permit of my entering on another most important point:—the development of the gifts of our office-bearers in connection with the evangelization of the masses. Many an elder, aye, and many a member, is nobly fitted to give most efficient aid, not only in visiting, but in addressing the masses. We have but very partially availed ourselves of the gifts bestowed by the Spirit on our churches for spreading abroad the Gospel, and that, too, under the orderly government of the Church.

Once more, much has yet to be done for the better keeping of the Lord's-day, both by rich and poor, in their own families. The members of our congregations should do more on Sunday for the instruction of their children. The custom is, among even intelligent working-men, to hand them over—their children—to a Sunday School, which, possibly, they never themselves entered, and with whose teaching and discipline they are utterly unacquainted, while they themselves teach them nothing. There are thus, I am convinced, thousands of children of professing Christians who never heard religious truth confessed or taught by the lips of father or mother. Why cannot the parents teach them? They are perhaps not "learned;" but if not, they should learn. Yet, are they not hearers of the Gospel? Do they not sit at the Lord's table, and remember Jesus? And is it possible that they cannot teach their children anything about the Name in which they have been baptized,—Father, Son, and Spirit? It is not "learning" that is needed, far less hard, dry lessons; but loving, true words,—few, perhaps, but simple and hearty, so as to help a child to rise from the knowledge and love of the father on earth to the Father in heaven. Now, this, as a supplement to any instruction given by pastor or teacher, would be a good work for the Lord's-day, whether walking with the children, or talking with them amidst the pleasant, frank, free, and natural, social intercourse of the fireside; so that the Lord's-day would be in the children's memory,—not the sullen day, but literally the Sun-day of the week.

Rich men, I am disposed to think, need to be stirred up to the performance of the same duties. Some, I fear, who profess to be Christians, hand over to mothers, tutors, or governesses, the blessed privilege of instructing their children. They thus give the impression, unconsciously, that they are ashamed to make any such confession of interest in Christ and His truth. On any other subject, however vain, trifling, or worldly, they may find words to speak, fully, confidentially, and earnestly. But of religion! That seems a solemn secret. The Lord's-day is the one above all others when, from its very design, a blessed opportunity is given for associating the name of father and mother in the minds of the boys and girls—those young, but sinful and immortal beings!—with what alone can enable them to fulfil the end of their being, and unite them for ever to each other in God. It is the one day, moreover, which affords time and opportunity for our bridging over the fearful gulph which separates the rich from the poor. This fact is one of the saddest, and one of the most momentous in the condition of our great cities—the separation of classes. They do not know each other, any more than if the Atlantic flowed between them; and therefore there is no mutual love, no mutual respect, none whatever, except what arises from the accidental connection between employers and employed. "Oh! day thrice holy," which enables the rich and poor to meet together. On other days both are "too busy." On this day both, in God's providence, have time given them for works of good. Can we conceive of the glorious results to our city if even one thousand

members, gathered from all our churches of every denomination,—and I believe they could easily afford many more of thoughtful, loving, and intelligent Christians, of good social position,—who would take each, say, ten persons, among the more ignorant and careless, or the sick, the aged, the lonely, from our poor; whose acquaintance they would respectfully and friendly—not patronizingly—endeavour to make; and whom, with good sense, good feeling, and the humility of true love, they would try and help in any way,—and if in no other way, at least by brotherly sympathy, and, if needed, brotherly or sisterly instruction, and temporal aid:—would not such labour as this of the upper one thousand (equal to about one congregation!) among the lower ten thousand, do more to make Christianity a reality to them, its life beautiful, its laws glorious, His day and worship appreciated, than all the tracts ever printed, and meetings ever held, and resolutions ever passed, on this subject? This is one way; most trying and difficult I admit, but most effectual for teaching our people to keep the Lord's-day holy, and to change a mere doctrine, associated with apparent gloom, as if under the law, into a practical duty, discharged with a joyous and free spirit, as becomes the Gospel. If the veil of Moses was withdrawn, it would only be to let the light of the glory of God shine as seen in the face of Jesus Christ!

Finally, it appears to me that, before we can attract the masses to our churches, we must labour to make our services more attractive,—not by mere forms addressed to the flesh, but by realities to which the spirits of men may respond. We want shorter, more frequent, and more simple prayers; with praise that shall, according to God's will, be real music, which is so pleasing, and not discord, which is so painful. We require more intelligible discourses, dealing with the felt wants of men, and which men can feel to be helpful to them in real life. No mere laws, of course, can drive men to church; but truth and goodness, and love and mercy will, under God, if anything will, attract, retain, and bless. I never expect, verily, to make the Lord's-day, or any spiritual duty, agreeable to ungodly men; but it may be made, according to God's will, more pleasing and edifying to Christian men, and to those sincerely seeking to become such. And believing as we do in the Holy Spirit, and in His abiding with, and in the Church of Christ; and that it is His work—His joy—to glorify the Son, that the Son may glorify the Father, by His giving eternal life to men. Oh, let us never despair! but work with Him; and work, therefore, with the strength and joy that spring from faith. Ah! brethren, the Sabbath question, if we will only grasp it, goes deeper down than we choose, perhaps, to think. It implies many weighty and practical questions and duties, which it is difficult calmly to weigh and meet. It cannot be solved by words, unless it ends there, but by works only.

My prayer to Almighty God is, that He may guide us into all truth, and the performance of all duty! If the results of this great discussion may appear to some to threaten the introduction of more of the week-day into the Lord's-day, I pray God that this may not



happen, unless from more of the spirit of the Lord's-day having been first introduced into week-days by every day being made holy—the first day most of all—unto the Lord. For he who sanctifies every day of the week, regarding each day as holy unto the Lord, in its ordinary labours and recreations, in its joys, and sorrows, will not be less, but the more, disposed to keep holy “the Lord's-day,” and to rejoice in all its spiritual privileges! I conclude by thanking you cordially, my very dear brethren, for your extreme patience and goodness in having listened to me so long on a question on which—in some of its aspects—I have the misfortune to differ from many of you.

## APPENDIX.

---

### A.—PAGE 11.

*"It authoritatively binds us to keep THE seventh day holy."*

So Milton—*Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, Book II. chap. 7:—

"If, on the plea of a divine command, they impose upon us the observance of a particular day, how do they presume, without the authority of a divine command, to substitute another day in its place? or, in other words, to pronounce, that not merely the seventh day, which was appointed for the observation of the Israelites alone, but any one of the seven, may, even on the authority of the Fourth Commandment itself, be kept holy; and that this is to be accounted an article of moral duty among all nations.

"In the first place, I do not see how this assertion can be established, for it is impossible to extort such a sense from the words of the commandment; seeing that the reason for which the command itself was originally given—namely, as a memorial of God's having rested from the creation of the world—cannot be transferred from the seventh day to the first; nor can any new motive be substituted in its place, whether the resurrection of our Lord or any other, without the sanction of a divine commandment. Since, then, it is evident from more than one passage of Scripture, that the original Sabbath is abrogated, and since we are nowhere told that it has been transferred from one day to another, nor is any reason given why it should be so transferred, the Church, when she sanctioned a change in this matter, evinced, not her obedience to God's command, (inasmuch as the command existed no longer,) but her own rightful liberty; for in any other view it can only be termed folly. To make any change whatever in a commandment of God, whether we believe that commandment to be still in force or not, is equally dangerous, and equally reprehensible; inasmuch as in so doing we are either annulling what is not yet repealed, or re-enacting what is obsolete."

Bishop Hopkins—*An Exposition of the Commandments*, p. 134, (Ed. of 1710:)—

"We do not celebrate the Lord's-day itself upon any obligation laid upon us by the letter of this Fourth Commandment, (for that expressly enjoins the seventh day from the creation, whereas ours is the eighth;) but only from the analogy and perfection of moral reason, which requires that a due and convenient portion of our time should be separated to the service and worship of God."

Dr. Arnold—*Sermons*, vol. iii., Sermon 22:—

"Are we right in keeping the Sunday, or are we not right? The Fourth Commandment does not answer this question by itself; no, not though it be used every Sunday in our own service. For we do not keep the Fourth Commandment, seeing that we do not keep holy the seventh day, but the first; not the day on which God rested from all His works, but the day on which He raised up Jesus Christ from the dead. And as to altering a command of the Law, he must know little of the obedience which the Law requires who could think that men might alter it at their discretion."

Archbishop—Whately, *On some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul*, Essay V.:—

“In saying that there is no mention of the Lord’s-day in the Mosaic law, we mean, that there is not only no mention of that specific festival which Christians observe on the first day of the week, in memory of our Lord’s resurrection on the morning following the Jewish Sabbath, but that there is not any injunction to sanctify *one day in seven*. Throughout the whole of the Old Testament, we never hear of keeping holy *some one day in every seven*, but the seventh day, as the day in which God ‘rested from all His works.’”

Dean Alford—*Second Letter to Mr. Sperling*, pp. 12, 13:—

“If I were disposed to turn the tables—which I am not, for I as little believe my Sabbatarian friends guilty of disingenuousness as they me—might I not fairly say, to which of the two does the charge more properly apply—to myself, who, regarding the commandment as not binding in its literal sense, read it as interpreted by the Gospel and the Church,—or to them who, regarding it as strictly and literally obligatory on them, obey its command to observe *one prescribed day* for a *definite assigned reason*, and in a *strictly specified manner*, by observing *another day* for a *totally different reason*, and in a *manner entirely their own*;—first praying that they may keep the law, then abrogating every word of it, substituting a new law of their own, and investing it with the authority of the other.”

#### B.—PAGE 11.

“*The Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment was from evening to evening.*”

This is of course admitted by all parties, and the Jews to this day keep their Sabbath “from even to even.” In our own city, this seems at one time to have been the rule. Thus Woodrow, extracting from the records of the kirk-session of Glasgow, in 1590, writes, that “the bretheren interpret the Sabbath to be from sun to sun; and afterwards the session explain it, that no work is to be done from light to light in winter, and betwixt sun to sun in summer.”—*Memorabilia*, vol. ii., Part II., p. 35.

In 1594, “The Presbiterie of Glasgw statutis and ordenis that gif Mungo Craig sall playe on his pypes on the Sondaye *fra the sunne rysing quhill the sunn goinge* to in ony placewithin the boundis of this Presbiterie, that he incontinent thairefter sal be summarlie excommunicat. Lykwise statutis that wpone the Sondaye *in the said tyme*, nane gif thameselfis to pastymes and profane gaymes within the said boundis, vnder the pane of the censures of the kirk; and this to be intimat furth of pulpet the nixt Sondaye be everie minister within this Presbiterie, and specialie be the minister of Ruglen.”—*Miscellany of the Maitland Club*, i., p. 67. In 1608, the kirk-session of Glasgow made an order, “That ther be no buying of timber on Sunday at the watter of Clyde, from sun-rising to sun-setting.” In 1613, they ordain the “litters (dyers) not to big on their fires beneath their fats till after 4 on Sunday’s night.” In 1619, they ordain “that no fleshers slay flesh between light and light;” and this ordinance is repeated in 1622 and 1630. But in 1640, they “make a very strict act against profaning the Sunday; and declare it to be from 12 on Saturdayes night to 12 on Sunday’s night.”—Woodrow, *ut supra*. The same rule seems to have prevailed in Edinburgh prior to 1650. Thus, during the plague in 1574, or 7th September, the ministers, elders, and deacons thought “guid and necessar to institute ane Publiet Fast and Humiliation, with ane ernst prayar adjunct thairto, within this burgh for the space of aucht dayis nixt to cum, *quhillk salbegyne vpone setterday the ferd day of this instant at aucht houris at ewin, and sua to continew quhill sonday come aucht dayis at sex houris at nycht*, ACCORDING TO THE ORDOUR OF ALL PUBLIC FASTIS OSBERUIT IN TYMES BYPAST, Requiring the hail faythfull of this burgh to observe the samyn in all poyntis as thai tender the mercies of God.”—*Miscellany, ut*



*supra*, p. 105. And again, on 7th December of the same year, they ordered another "publict fast and humiliatioun for the space of aucht dayis, togidder with ane ernist inuocatioun and prayar for the assistance of Godis holy spreit that our synnis may be pardonit, quhairby the said appeirand scourge may be removit, and Godis vrayth pasifit; the said publict Fast to begynne vpon satterday nixt to cum, at aucht houris at ewin, and sua to continew quhill sonday at sex houris at ewin, thair foud only to be breid and drink with all kind of sobrietie."—*Miscellany, ut supra*, page 111. In 1646 the same parties recommended "that the ports (gates) of Edinr. sall stand closed from Saturday, at night, till Sunday, at six o'clock at night; and none of them to be opened all the while, save only one of the south ports, to give way for watering of horse, at morning and evening; at which time they must be attended by some faithful, honest man, for restraining the people's faith-breaking, and thereafter to be closed."—*Appendix to Report of Sir Andrew Agnew's Committee*, 1832, p. 304. In 1650, however, the magistrates of Edinburgh ordered the gates to be closed from Saturday night at 10 o'clock, to Monday morning at 4 o'clock.—*Coltness Collections*, Mait. Club, p. 368.

The passage referred to from Michaelis will be found in Article 195 of his *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses*.

## C.—PAGE 11.

"It is a fair question, indeed, how far the blessed rest secured by the Jewish Sabbath was at all connected with PUBLIC worship?"

See as to this, *Vitringa, De Synagoga vetere libri tres*,—Lib. I., p. 2, cap. 2, and Michaelis, *ut sup.*, Art. 52.

## D.—PAGE 12.

"I mean Mr. Begg."

See "*An Examination of the Authority for a Change of the Weekly Sabbath at the Resurrection of Christ, proving that the practice of the Church, in Substituting the First Day of the Week for the appointed Seventh Day, is unsanctioned by the New Testament Scriptures.*"—By James A. Begg. Glasgow, 1850. Pp. 156.

## E.—PAGE 12.

"In a hundred things we do on Sunday what it would have been unlawful for the pious Jew to have done on his Sabbath."

This needs no proof; but I cannot resist publishing the following very striking letter, which I have received, since my speech was delivered, from one who was for some time a missionary in India, and which will illustrate some of the effects of our practice in this respect:—

"REV. SIR,—I have been listening, with some interest, to the discussions in which you have been engaged in this much-talked-of Sabbath-question; and as I have had a pretty good opportunity of seeing round me for many years, in foreign lands, I think it right to say to you what I think as to the effect of binding down the heathen and others to the Decalogue, as such.

"Take, for instance, the natives of India, where the Church of our fathers has been labouring for many years. I have been myself, and I know many others have been, likewise, much puzzled with the strange inconsistency between the precept and practice of our ministers and missionaries; and so have the natives, though they possess enough of their oriental cunning, to keep even their own masters in the dark as to what they think.

"When they are told, 'Thus saith the Lord, Thou shalt do no work,' &c.,

'thou, nor thy man-servant,' &c.,—what so common as to see or hear a group of the domestics sit down on a Sabbath evening, with their Hookah or Chillum, and discuss the pros and cons of precept and example of the padre sahib. They begin with the bishop with his £3000 yearly, the minister with £600 to £1200, the missionary with £200 to £400, and the city missionary with £60 to £150; and what do they say? Just this: that every one of the padre sahibs makes out the list of his own necessities according to his pay (tullup); and that while their masters tell them to do no work on Sabbath, (Etwar,) they compel them to work all night and day, Sabbath and Saturday, in the face of God's command. (Kodah ka hookum.) Now, sir, here is a list of the servants that our good ministers keep in India, just because they are able to keep them. They have their khansamah, kitmutgar, babengee, bearer, coachman, two syees, matther, dhobie, bheestie; and their wives have their ayah. These servants say, 'We have to do the sahib's work (kam) in the house; we have to clean the horses and carriage on Sabbath; and we have to pull the punkah over them in the church for hours, morning and evening; and when they come home, we have to pull the punkah over them all night. The matther must do his work in the bath-room twice a-day, and yet they tell us we must do no work; do they think that this is no work, or does *God give one order* (hookum) for us, and *another for them*? We see the Jews, (Yahudee log,) they will not work themselves on their Saturday (Suneechar), nor make their establishment of servants (Nowkar chacker) work; it is all humbug, (Sub tamash Bhatt hie,) God's Word is one, but the padre sahib gives other orders. Who can tell which we are to hear? We (Mussulmans) go to our own musjeed on our own Friday (Joommah), and the Jews have their own caste, but we see this, Christians have more caste than we have, and they cannot agree over them.' Now, sir, I am well aware of the necessities of a hot climate, and the many luxuries that Europeans require there, that never would be thought of here; but, sir, is it necessary to break one command to keep another? I say that there is no luxury that people can afford that should be dispensed with, such as the use of ice in the water, and the punkah night and day, Sabbath and Saturday; but what do these long-headed, clear-sighted Hindoos, Mussulmans, and Gentiles, say on the subject? Is it not, that you are making them do what you tell them it is wrong to do on the Sabbath-day?

"What, sir, I ask, in the name of reason and common-sense, do they know of our interpretation of those two elastic door-posts, necessity and mercy? Do they not see every ecclesiastic, from the highest to the lowest, just stretch them out to answer themselves. Everything is necessary, in India, to counteract the effects of the climate; it is necessary to live in an upper-roomed house, so as to be out of the malaria that rises for 10 or 12 feet above the ground, and all who can, do keep upper-roomed houses; yet how many thousands are there who cannot, and must live on the lower floor; and just so with the punkah-bearer, two or three men are kept, night and day, Sabbath and Saturday, at work, just because it is conducive to comfort in a hot climate.

"But, sir, what has all this got to do with the Fourth Commandment? It gives no license for all this; and the puzzle to the natives is, that they are told that they are to keep it, while they see their teachers break it every week.

"I am aware, sir, that some people have represented the natives of India as a dull, stupid race, and in some respects, this is true; but just ask a lawyer, a merchant, or broker in any of the large towns in India, and they will tell you that they, the natives, can split a hair with any of them. And again, sir, those of them who are taught at the missionary school, are not so dull or blind as not to see the palpable contradiction between your Confession of Faith, which says, as Dr. M<sup>r</sup> Taggart explains it, '*a seventh day*,' and as the Catechism has it, '*the seventh day*.'

"And again, sir, what do these dull, stupid, yet long-headed natives say about the Fourth Commandment as to sea voyages? Just this, that 'God

sends strong winds,' and makes the Christian break His own commands. They are acute enough to see, that those who press home on them the Fourth Commandment, are puzzled in this dilemma; and while the Jewish law is pressed on any man outside the bounds of the Jewish land, the same consequence must follow. There is no permission for sea voyages in that command, and I myself have pressed the subject home on strict Sabbatarians at sea, but had to leave a loop-hole for them to get out of. And I was forced to the conclusion, that it is the *precept* that is at fault, and not the practice. I have seen some good, but strict men, of the old school, spend days and weeks of misery, on account of having to touch a rope on Sabbath, and covering a guilty and condemned conscience, from which they might have been relieved, had they left the Decalogue to the Jews, or given up their work and profession at sea.

"Now, sir, I am aware it will be at once stated that so many good men have been in India, and that none of them ever put this forward before. This, I say, is not true, for it was brought forward twenty years ago in the southern parts of India, and much was said on both sides. But I must confess, it was very painful to see the miserable shifts to which some were driven, when their own inconsistencies were hurled in their face; who came down with an anathema maranatha on all who scouted the idea of being bound by a law, which the ministers and missionaries themselves break every Sabbath.

"Any man in India may, if he wishes, hear the opinion of the natives on this, if he can speak to them, and if *they* are not afraid of him. Of course it requires some tact and skill to ingratiate yourself into their feelings; but once that is effected, you may get any information you want. But for want of that tact, you may live fifty years among them and remain ignorant.

"Again, sir, they can see, in some town in India, the representatives of as many, if not more, nations than were collected on the day of Pentecost; and they see that every caste has its own Sabbath; and in none of these do they see such flat contradictions as with our strict Sabbatarians, who keep the first day of the week, while the Greeks keep the second, the Persians the third, the Assyrians the fourth, the Egyptians the fifth, the Mussulmen the sixth, and the Jews the seventh day of the week.—Trusting you will excuse my taking up so much of your time, I remain, yours truly."

#### F.—PAGE 14.

*"I state the fact only as it illustrates the feelings and practices of thousands in the North regarding the Lord's-day."*

The following letter from the *Scotsman* of November 25, 1865, confirms the truth of the story referred to, while at the same time it gives a better version of it:—

*"Edinburgh, 23rd November, 1865.*

"SIR,—Dr. Macleod, in his great speech before the Glasgow Presbytery lately, referred, in illustration of his subject, to an incident regarding a ham, which, from his seeming not to know the circumstances connected with it particularly, was ineffectively told, and consequently has since been the occasion of a great deal of jeering remark. The story, however, is a good one, and it is simply this:—Several gentlemen had taken for a few weeks certain salmon and trout fishings in the Lews, and before proceeding thither, they were given to understand that, as the inn at Colarnish—the only place of up-putting at their command—was miserably provided with all sorts of things in the shape of edibles, they would require to take with them a supply of bread, potatoes, beef, &c. Amongst other such matters was a large Yorkshire ham. On the Sunday, when the party had done breakfast, the innkeeper came to them and put the question as to 'What they would like for dinner that day?' when one of them replied, 'You had better cut the ham in two, and boil one-half for dinner; the other half may be kept for boiling for breakfast.' 'Ay,' replied mine host; 'but how



would you like it cuttit?" 'Oh,' replied the speaker for the party, 'cut the flesh to the bone with a knife, and then take a saw and saw the bone.' 'Well, gentlemen,' rejoined the innkeeper, 'I have no objection to use a knife on the Sabbath-day, but I could not use a saw.' 'Have you got a saw in the house?' 'Yes,' 'Bring it if you please.' And so the saw was brought, and the worthy innkeeper—for a worthy man he is—cut the flesh with a knife; and though he could not conscientiously saw the bone himself, he held the two ends of the same, while the individual who mentioned the circumstance to me did so to the satisfaction of all parties.—I am, &c.,

DRAWING THE LINE."

It would be a most ungracious task to select from the records of northern presbyteries, or of southern ones either, the innumerable examples of that spirit of Judaism which, so long as the Church had the power of civil coercion, made the Scottish Sabbath truly a day of pains and penalties. But I cannot refrain from referring to a confirmation of my remarks, furnished by the evidence of a witness,—a solicitor in Inverness, on an investigation before the Presbytery of Inverness of a charge, to which I will not further refer here,—not, be it remembered, in the seventeenth, nor yet in the eighteenth century, but in the week following that in which this speech was delivered. I quote from the *Glasgow Herald* of 24th November:—

"I meant," said the witness, referring to a remark he had previously made, "that from my long residence in Inverness, and being a native of it, and consequently pretty well acquainted with the views of the people, that many have peculiar notions about what the conduct of a minister ought to be."

"Do you mean on a Saturday night, as this was?"—"Not particularly so; but I know of some people here who have conscientious objections against a minister going to the Post Office, or even being outside his own door, on a Saturday."

Since my speech was delivered, I have received the following letter on one of the points as to which I have been accused of exaggeration:—

"Melfort, 9th December, 1865.

"MY DEAR DR. MACLEOD,

"Shortly after your speech on the Sabbath question at the meeting of the Glasgow Presbytery, I was in company with three West Highland ministers of the Established Church, to whom I expressed my doubts as to the correctness of your assertion, that a considerable number of ministers abstained from shaving on Sundays, from conscientious motives. To my great surprise, I found that two out of the three themselves performed the operation overnight, for fear of breaking the Sabbath; and the third mentioned, that when he was a student, he was found fault with for not having a close-shaven chin on Monday,—the inference being, that as he had not shaved on that day, he probably had done so on the one immediately preceding.—Yours sincerely,

A. M. CAMPBELL."

G.—PAGE 14.

"Things have been done, within our memories, by clergy, magistrates, and police, in the way of interfering with others, which, thanks to public opinion, would not be tolerated now."

In the west of Scotland, the custom of perambulating the streets in quest of Sabbath-breakers, seems to have continued to a later date than elsewhere in Scotland. (See passages cited in Cox's *Sabbath Laws and Sabbath Duties*, p. 312, note.) The late Rev. Dr. M'Farlane, of Renfrew, gave the following evidence as to this before Sir Andrew Agnew's Committee, (Question 3693):

—“It is an old Scottish practice,” says he, “which I have heard often spoken of by those who lived a generation before me, and of which I have also heard much from the members of my own Church, when I was a minister in one of the suburbs of Glasgow. Elders of our churches were, at the period to which I refer, accustomed to walk the streets in towns, two and two in turns, during the hours of divine service, to take notice of children or disorderly persons strolling about, and to attempt, by moral suasion, to induce them to go to their houses, or to go to church; and if those means were inefficient, *they were handed over to the civil magistrate.* This practice continued till, from an increase of population, an increase of vice, and a growing want of support on the part of the magistrates, it was gradually given up; and I am not aware at this moment whether any society of the description now given exists in Scotland; but I believe, from the accounts I have had, that they did continue to exist till within a dozen years ago. I ought to have added, that this was not confined to the elders of the church, but that well-disposed individuals associated with them, took turn with them, and carried into effect those objects.”

## H.—PAGE 15.

“*Our own General Assembly, as late as 1834—I quote second-hand—in a Pastoral addressed to our churches, declared walking on Sunday to be ‘an impious encroachment on one of the inalienable prerogatives of the Lord’s-day.’*”

Dr. Hill writes to the Glasgow *Herald* of 29th November, that I am in error here, though the quotation he himself gives from the Pastoral is, I submit, proof that I am right. Here is the passage to which I referred,—*Acts of the General Assembly*, p. 1164 :—

“With deep concern we have learned, that in various parts of the country there has been, for a number of years past, a great increase of unnecessary travelling on the Lord’s-day, both for purposes of business and amusement; that shops have been kept open on that day for the sale of provisions and other articles of traffic; that multitudes, forgetful of their most sacred duties and their immortal interests, have become accustomed to *wander in the fields*, to frequent scenes of recreation, or to spend their time in riot and drunkenness, and other immoralities. . . . As the Lord God has appropriated the Sabbath to himself, it is an impious encroachment on His inalienable prerogative to attempt to convert it either into a day of business or a day of idleness and pastime. . . . Knowing the terrors of the Lord, we would persuade and adjure the hardened, by all that is bitter in remorse, by all that is intolerable in an awakened and unpurified conscience, by all that is fearful on the deathbed of impenitence, by all that is scorching in the frown of an unreconciled Judge, by all that is repulsive in the fellowship of accursed spirits, by all that is wofully agonizing in the gnawing of the worm that dieth not, and in the fire that is not quenched, to awaken from the dream of guilty insensibility, and to flee from the wrath to come to the hope set before them in the Gospel.”

The above, it must be admitted, gives a sad picture of the state of Scotland,—a state of things, be it remembered, which (if it *was* actually as bad as here described) was produced in this country, notwithstanding the prevalent teaching as to Sabbath observance. But may it not be questioned whether any but bad results can follow from classing together “wandering in the fields” with “spending time in riot and drunkenness, and other immoralities?”

The speakers who took part against me in the Presbytery, spoke out so generally against this prohibition of breathing God’s air on God’s own day, that nothing need be said here on that subject now. I add the

words of one whose name is dear to all God's people in England and in Scotland,—Charles Simeon,—because they are weighty, not only on this head, but on others touched upon in my speech:—

“In my own personal habit I am as strict as most; but in my judgment, as before God, I think that many religious characters—Ministers as well as others—are in error. I think that many Judaize too much, and that they would have joined the Pharisees in condemning our Lord on many occasions. But I would have you remark this: I do not think that they err in acting up to their own principles, (*there they are right*;) but that they err in making their own standard a standard for all others. This is a prevailing evil among religious persons. They will in effect argue thus:—‘I do not walk out on a Sabbath-day, *therefore* an artisan may not walk out into the fields for an hour on that day.’ They forget that the poor man is confined all the rest of the week, which they are not: and that they themselves will walk in their own garden when the poor have no garden to walk in. Now in this I do not think that they act towards others, as they, in a change of circumstances, would think it right for others to act towards them: and if your brother will limit his refreshment to such a relaxation as is necessary for health, or materially conducive to it, I shall agree with him, and shall rank this amongst works of necessity or of charity. Again, I am not prepared to utter either anathemas or lamentations if Ministers of State occasionally, in a time of great pressure of public business, and in a quiet way, avail themselves of an hour or two for conference with each other on that day. I do not commend it; but I do not condemn it. They cannot command their own times. Public affairs may be full as pressing, and may call for immediate conference, as much as an ox or an ass for deliverance from a pit into which it has fallen; and I think that love to one's country may justify a deviation from a ritual observance of the Sabbath, as much as love or pity for a beast. In fact, if the most scrupulous will examine the frame of their own minds, and the real spirituality of their own conversation for two or three hours on some part of the Sabbath, they will find but little right, whatever their disposition be, to cast a stone at a poor man with his family, or at a Minister of State with his compeers. Again, I say, *they may be right*; but the others who think and act differently are not *therefore wrong*. Those who ate, and those who refused to eat, meat offered to idols, were *both right* if they acted to the Lord, as were those also who observed, and those who did not observe, certain days, which, under the Jewish dispensation, were actually prescribed. I will tell you what I consider the perfect rule: let all judge for themselves in relation to the ritual observance of such matters; the strong not despising the weak, and the weak forbearing to sit in judgment on the strong. This will be the surest and best discharge of the duty of all parties whether to *God* or *man*: to God, who has said, ‘I will have mercy and not sacrifice;’ and to man, who should be left to stand or fall to his own Master.”—*Life*, p. 292-4.

#### I.—PAGE 15.

“Can we let young children amuse themselves in any way on Sunday?—No. Why?—*The Fourth Commandment.*”

The following passage is from a sermon by Dr. Chalmers, preached in the church where my speech was delivered:—

“Certain it is that the Sabbath-day may be made to wear an aspect of great gloom and great ungainliness, with each hour having its own irksome punctuality attached to it; and when the weary formalist, labouring to acquit himself in full tale and measure of all his manifold observations, is either sorely fatigued in the work of filling up the unvaried routine, or is sorely oppressed in conscience, should there be the slightest encroachment either on its regularity or on its entireness. We may follow him through his Sabbath history, and mark how, in the spirit of bondage, this drivelling slave plies



at an unceasing task, to which, all the while, there is a secret dissatisfaction in his own bosom, and with which he lays an intolerable penance on his whole family. He is clothed in the habiliments of seriousness, and holds out the aspect of it; but never was aspect more unpromising or more unlovely. And, in this very character of severity, is it possible for him to move through all the stages of Sabbath observancy—first, to eke out his morning hour of solitary devotion; and then to assemble his household to the psalms, and the readings, and the prayers, which are all set forth in due and regular celebration; and then, with stern parental authority, to muster, in full attendance for church, all the children and domestics who belong to him; and then, in his compressed and crowded pew, to hold out, in complete array, the demureness of spirit that sits upon his own countenance, and the demureness of constraint that sits on the general face of his family; and then, to follow up the public services of the day by an evening, the reigning expression of which shall be that of strict, unbending austerity, when the exercises of patience, and the exercises of memory, and a confinement that must not be broken from even for the tempting air and beauty of a garden, and the manifold other interdicts that are laid on the vivacity of childhood, may truly turn every Sabbath as it comes round into a periodical season of sufferance and dejection. And thus, instead of being a preparation of love and joy for a heaven of its own likeness, may all these proprieties be discharged for no other purpose than that of pacifying the jealousies of a God of vengeance, and working out a burdensome acquittal from the exactions of this hard and unrelenting task-master.”—*Congregational Sermons*. Sermon XIII., vol ii., pp. 274–275.

## K.—PAGE 19.

“‘*I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage,*’—a blessed deliverance indeed, but which does not apply to us as Gentiles.”

I spoke almost in the words of Luther, though not so strongly—

“The Ten Commandments,” writes the Reformer, “do not apply to us Gentiles and Christians, but only to the Jews. If a preacher wishes to force you back to Moses, ask him whether you were brought by Moses out of Egypt? If he says, No; then say, How, then, does Moses concern me, since he speaks to the people that have been brought out of Egypt? In the New Testament Moses comes to an end, and his laws lose their force. He must bow in the presence of Christ.”—Luther on the *Ten Commandments*, quoted by Hengstenberg *On the Lord's-day*, p. 62.

Again, “We must stop the mouths of the factious spirits who say, ‘Thus says Moses.’ Then do you reply, Moses does not concern us. If I accept Moses in one commandment, I must accept the whole Moses. In that case I should be obliged to be circumcised, and to wash my clothes in a Jewish manner, and to eat and drink, and dress, and do everything of this kind in the manner in which the Jews are commanded to do these in the law. Therefore we will not obey Moses, nor accept him. Moses died, and his covenant terminated when Christ came.”

And again, “The words of Scripture prove clearly to us that the Ten Commandments do not affect us; for God has not brought us out of Egypt, but only the Jews.”—*Instructions to Christians how to make use of Moses*.—*Lutheri Opera*, III., 63. Jena, 1603.

So Archbishop Whately, in his *Fifth Essay on some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul*:—

“The very law itself indicates, on the face of it, that the whole of its precepts were intended for the Israelites exclusively, (on which supposition they cannot of course be, by their own authority, binding on Christians,) not only from the intermixture of civil and ceremonial precepts with moral, but from the very terms in which even these last are delivered. For instance, there cannot be any duties more clearly of universal obligation than

that of the worship of the one true God alone, and that of honouring parents; yet the precepts for both of these are so delivered as to address them to the children of Israel exclusively: 'I am the Lord thy God, who *brought thee out of the land of Egypt*, out of the house of bondage; thou shalt have none other gods but Me.' And again, 'Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.'"

## L.—PAGE 19.

"*The promise annexed to the Fifth Commandment is local and temporal.*"

So John Selden—*Table-talk*, p. 195. Irving's Edit., Edin. 1854.

"Why should I think all the Fourth Commandment belongs to me, when all the Fifth does not? What land will the Lord give me for honouring my father? It was spoken to the Jews with reference to the land of Canaan; but the meaning is, if I honour my parents, God will also bless me. We read the Commandments in the Church-service, as we do David's Psalms, not that all there concerns us, but a great deal of them does."

Dr. P. Doddridge—*Pneumatology*, v. ii., p. 361, Lect. 198. Scholium 3. Lond. 1794:—

"Nevertheless we allow, that the observation of the Sabbath is not to be urged as of universal obligation, merely because it is to be found in the Jewish Decalogue, and that its place there only obliged the Jews; since, in the preface to those Ten Commandments, their deliverance from Egypt is urged as a reason for observing them, and the Fifth Commandment is enforced by promises peculiar to the Jews: not to insist on the addition (Deut. v. 15) which is probably to be considered as the words of Moses, not of God, and a comment on the Fourth Commandment, rather than a part of it."

Dr. Whewell—*Elements of Morality*, B. III., ch. xvi. :—

"The Ten Commandments are not binding upon Christians because they are parts of the law of Moses, but because they are part of the moral law. *Thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not commit adultery*; are precepts which do not derive their authority from any special command, but from the moral nature God has given to man. There are parts of the Ten Commandments which are merely arbitrary, or local, or temporary, and apply only to the ancient Jews. Such is the reason given in the fifth command, *that thy days, &c.*; such is the command of absolute abstinence from labour on the Sabbath; such is the selection of the seventh day of the week for the day of rest, if that selection is really included in the command."

## M.—PAGE 20.

"*It is the Decalogue, viewed in this aspect, . . . which I presume to think has been ABROGATED by being nailed to Christ's cross.*"

Much has been said of my use of this expression. It is simply amazing to me that my meaning could have for a moment been misunderstood by any one. I have already quoted Baxter (who uses the same word, and in the very same sense) in the text, and can add nothing to his defence against the same Antinomianism with which I have been so unsparingly charged, and with which Luther, for exactly the same offence, (see Appendix K,) was charged before him. I may, however, quote the following from Archbishop Whately, who, though I differ from him on other parts of the question, ably argues out this point, on which we are at one:—

"It cannot be denied that he, Paul, does speak, frequently and strongly, of the termination of the Mosaic law, and of the exemption of Christians from its obligations, without ever limiting and qualifying the assertion,—without even hinting at a distinction between one part which is abrogated, and another which remains in full force. It cannot be said that he had in

his mind the Ceremonial law alone, and was alluding merely to the abolition of that; for in the very passages in question, he makes such allusions to *sin*, as evidently shew that he had the *moral* law in his mind; as, for instance, where he says, 'The law was added because of transgressions:'—'by the law was the knowledge of sin;' with many other such expressions. And it is remarkable, that even when he seems to feel himself pressed with the mischievous practical consequences which either had been, or he is sensible might be, drawn from his doctrines, he never attempts to guard against these by limiting his original assertion;—by declaring that though part of the law was at an end, still, part continued to be binding; but he always inculcates the necessity of moral conduct on some *different* ground: For instance, 'What shall we say, then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid!' He does not then add, that a part of the Mosaic law remains in force; but urges this consideration, 'How shall we, who are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' . . . . . 'Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we *should not serve sin*.' And again, 'Shall we sin because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid! Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey? whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness.' . . . . . 'Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.' And such also is his tone in every passage relating to the same subject.

"Now, let us but adopt the obvious interpretation of the Apostle's words, and admit the entire abrogation, according to him, of the Mosaic law; concluding that it was originally designed for the Israelites alone, and that its dominion over *them* ceased when the Gospel-system was established: and we shall find that this concession does not go a step towards introducing the Antinomian conclusion, that moral conduct is not required of Christians. For it is evident that the natural distinctions of right and wrong, which conscience points out, must remain where they were. These distinctions, not having been introduced by the Mosaic law, cannot, it is evident, be overthrown by its removal; any more than the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem implied the destruction of the Mount Zion whereon it was built. The Apostle does indeed speak, in some passages, of the law as having been a guide and instructor in matters of morality; as where he says, 'I had not known sin but by the law;' but that this must not be understood, in the fullest extent, as implying that no moral obligation could exist, or could be understood, independent of the Mosaic revelation, is evident, not only from the nature of the case, but from his own remarks in the same epistle, relative to 'the Gentiles, which have not the law,' being capable of '*doing by nature* the things contained in the law . . . their *conscience* also bearing witness, and their thoughts accusing or else excusing one another;' and of their 'knowing' (in cases where they committed sin) 'that they who do such things are worthy of death.' To say, therefore, that no part of the Jewish law is binding on Christians, is very far from leaving them at liberty to disregard all moral duties. For, in fact, the very definition of a *moral* duty, *implies* its universal obligation independent of all *enactment*. The precepts respecting sacrifices, for instance, and other ceremonial observances, we call *positive* ordinances; meaning, that the things in question become *duties* because they were commanded:—the commandment to love one's neighbour as oneself, on the contrary, we call a *moral* precept, on the very ground that this was a thing *commanded* because it was *right*. And it is evident, that what was right or wrong in itself before the law existed, must remain such after it is abrogated. Before the commandments to do no murder, and to honour one's parents, had been delivered from Mount Sinai, Cain was cursed for killing his brother, and Ham for dishonouring his father; which crimes,



therefore, could not cease to be such, at least, as any consequence of the abolition of that law.

"Nor need it be feared, that to proclaim an exemption from the Mosaic law should leave men without any moral guide, and at a loss to distinguish right and wrong: since, after all, the light of reason is that to which every man *must* be left, in the interpretation of that very law. For Moses, it should be remembered, did not write three distinct books, one of the Ceremonial law, one of the Civil, and a third of the Moral; nor does he hint at any such distinction. When, therefore, any one is told that a *part* of the Mosaic precepts are binding on us, viz., the *moral* ones, and if he ask *which* are the Moral precepts, and how to distinguish them from the Ceremonial and the Civil, with which they mingled, the answer must be, that his conscience, if he consult it honestly, will determine that point. So far, consequently, from the moral precepts of the law being, to the Christian, necessary as a guide to his judgment in determining *what* is right and wrong, on the contrary this moral judgment is necessary to determine *what* are the *moral* precepts of Moses.

"The study, indeed, of the moral law of Moses is profitable for instruction, and may serve to aid our judgment in some doubtful cases that may occur; provided we are careful to bear in mind all the circumstances under which each precept was delivered. For there is a presumption that what was commanded or prohibited by Moses, is right or wrong in itself, *unless some reason can be assigned*, which makes our case at present different from that of the Israelites;—some circumstance of distinction, which either leaves us more at large than they, or (as is oftener the case) calls for a higher and purer moral practice from us. But to consult a code of moral precepts for *instruction*, is very different from referring to that as a *standard*, and rule of conduct.

"If the notion, then, that such as are not under the Mosaic law, are, on that account, exempt from all moral obligations, be rejected as utterly groundless, and if, consequently, no practical danger or absurdity be involved in the supposition of that law being fully abrogated, the conclusion that it *is* so abrogated will hardly be any longer open to doubt; being evidently the most agreeable to the Apostle's expressions in their obvious, natural, and unrestrained sense."—Essay V., *ut supra*.

And in a note he adds:—

"I am inclined to believe that one reason which makes some persons reluctant to acknowledge the total abolition of the Mosaic law, is the notion that the sanctity of the 'Christian Sabbath' depends on the Fourth Commandment, and that, consequently, the reverence due to the Lord's-day would be destroyed, or impaired, by our admitting the Ten Commandments to be no longer binding. But a little reflection will satisfy any candid mind that there is no ground for any such suspicion, and that all the various opinions respecting the Lord's-day, however irreconcilable with each other, are all perfectly reconcilable with the belief of the abrogation of the Mosaic Law."

Dr. Arnold—*Life*, i., p. 355 (Ed. 1844):—

"It is not that we may pick and choose what commandments we like to obey, but, as all the commandments have no force upon us *as such*,—that is, as positive and literal commands addressed to ourselves,—it is only a question how far each commandment is applicable to us,—that is, how far we are in the same circumstances with those to whom it was given." And again, (L. 366,)—"Although I think that the whole law is done away with, so far as it is the law given on Mount Sinai; yet, so far as it is the law of the Spirit, I hold it to be all binding; and believing that our need of a Lord's-day is as great as ever it was, and that, therefore, its observance is God's will, and is likely, so far as we see, to be so to the end of time, I should think it most mischievous to weaken the respect paid to it."

Dr. George Cook—*General and Historical View of Christianity*, vol. ii., ch. 10, pp. 286-287.

"The Sabbath, as thus defined in the Decalogue, continued so long as the

Mosaical dispensation was obligatory; but it cannot have escaped any attentive reader of the Gospel, that whilst our Saviour, on the seventh-day, attended the Synagogue, and thus shewed His veneration for the authority by which it was hallowed, He on many occasions placed the spirit of the institution more prominently in view than the letter of it, doing without hesitation what the Pharisees, and those who affected peculiar strictness and holiness, considered as profaning the Sabbath. It inculcated the infinite value of mercy above sacrifice, explicitly declaring that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. When by His death, —which was the fulfilment of all that had been shadowed forth under the Jewish dispensation,—that dispensation was done away, the appointment of the Sabbath, that is, of a specific day for the service of God, and of a specific mode in which it was to be observed, ceased; these were comprehended under that handwriting of ordinances which was blotted out; the Apostle upon one occasion saying, ‘Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-day, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is Christ.’”

Dr. Reichel, in his notes to a very able sermon preached in Dublin in 1856, defends himself from an accusation similar in many respects to that brought against myself:—

“The evils,” he writes, “that have arisen from the exaggerated view generally taken of the Decalogue (as a supposed summary of the moral law), and which have been sanctioned by unreflecting reverence and unquestioned custom, may teach us how dangerous it is to yield to the temptation of giving a reason which is not true, but which the person to whom it is addressed will fancy to be true. Appeals to the Sabbath-command of the Decalogue in favour of the observance of the Lord’s-day, and of all church festivals, were originally made in the middle ages by Romish divines, who knew that those whom they wished to influence were too ignorant to draw the distinction between the moral and the ceremonial parts of the Decalogue, and could not therefore detect the fallacy of these appeals. This habit of appealing to the Decalogue in its turn countenanced the idea that it was a summary of the moral law; and this being once assumed as an unquestionable fact, ‘Sabbath observance,’ in spite of its evidently ceremonial nature, was boldly asserted to be a part of the moral law! Thus arose a perfect confusion of mind on the subject of the nature of a moral as distinguished from a ceremonial precept; an evil so great that it may be seriously questioned whether it do not more than counterbalance the advantage of reciting the Decalogue in the Communion Service; and whether it would not have been wiser to introduce into the service instead of the Decalogue ‘the two great commandments’ from which the Decalogue itself is derived, as was actually proposed at the Revolution of 1688.”—*The Lord’s-day nor the Sabbath*. By Charles Parsons Reichel, D.D., late Donellan Lecturer to the University of Dublin. Dub. 1859.

#### N.—PAGE 25.

“Many of our greatest thinkers and best commentators have been unable to find any evidence for this primeval Sabbath.”

I subjoin a few illustrations:—

*Justyn Martyr*.—“All these men before-named, (Adam, Enoch, Noah, Melchizedek, and Lot,) pleased God without observing the Sabbath; and after them, Abraham and all his posterity to the time of Moses.”—*Dialogue with Typho*. Therlby’s edit. 1722, p. 147. “If before Abraham there was no custom of circumcision, nor before Moses of celebrating the Sabbath—is there any need of these things?”—*Id.*, 183. “As, therefore, circumcision took its rise from Abraham, and the Sabbath and sacrifices, and offerings and festivals, (which, it hath been proved, were ordained on account of your

people's hardness of heart,) took their rise from Moses; so was it proper that these things should, according to the counsel of the Father, come to an end in Him, the Son of God, Jesus Christ."—*Ib.*, p. 222.

*Irenæus*.—"Abraham, without circumcision, and without observance of Sabbath, believed in God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God."—*Contra Hæres*, IV. 16.

*Tertullian*.—"Since God ordained that Adam should be neither circumcised nor an observer of the Sabbath, so he commanded Adam's son, Abel, when offering sacrifices to Him, though Abel was uncircumcised, and not an observer of the Sabbath;" and then he goes on to shew that neither Noah, Enoch, Melchizedek, Lot, nor Abraham, kept the Sabbath, and yet were approved of by God.—*Contra Judeos*, Rigault's edit., Paris, 1675, p. 185.

*Eusebius*.—"As the name Christian is intended to indicate this very idea, that a man, by the knowledge and doctrine of Christ, is distinguished by modesty and justice, by patience and a virtuous fortitude, and by a profession of piety towards the one and only true and supreme God, all this was no less studiously cultivated by them (the patriarchs, from Adam to Abraham) than by us. They did not, therefore, regard circumcision, nor observe the Sabbath; nor do we; neither do we abstain from certain foods, nor regard other injunctions which Moses subsequently delivered to be observed in types and symbols, because such things as these do not belong to Christians."—*Eccles. Hist.*, Cruse's transl., p. 46.

*Archbishop Branhall*.—"We find (from Adam to Moses) oblations, and priests, and sacrifices, and choirs, and oratories, and prayers, and thanksgivings, and vows, and whatsoever natural religion doth dictate about the service of God; but we find not an instance of the execution of this supposed law of the seventh-day Sabbath."—*On the Sabbath and Lord's-day*, p. 20.

*John Bunyan*.—"Question II.—Whether the seventh-day Sabbath, as to man's keeping of it holy, was ever made known to, or imposed by a positive precept upon him until the time of Moses? . . . As to the imposing of a seventh-day Sabbath upon men from Adam to Moses, of that we find nothing in Holy Writ, either from precept or example. . . . The seventh day, therefore, was not from Paradise, nor from nature, nor from the Fathers, but from the wilderness and from Sinai."—*Questions about the Nature and Perpetuity of the seventh-day Sabbath, and proof that the first day of the week is the true Christian Sabbath*.—Works, edited by Offer, vol. ii., pp. 363–5. Glasgow, 1853.

*John Milton*.—"With regard to the Sabbath, it is clear that God hallowed it to himself, and dedicated it to rest, in remembrance of the consummation of His work, (Gen ii. 2, 3; Exod. xxxi. 17.) Whether its institution was ever made known to Adam, or whether any commandment relative to its observance was given previous to the delivery of the law on Mount Sinai, much less whether any such was given before the fall of man, cannot be ascertained, Scripture being silent on the subject. The most probable supposition is, that Moses, who seems to have written the book of Genesis much later than the promulgation of the law, inserted this sentence from the Fourth Commandment, into what appeared a suitable place for it; where an opportunity was afforded for reminding the Israelites, by a natural and easy transition, of the reason assigned by God, many ages after the event itself, for His command with regard to the observance of the Sabbath by the covenanted people."—*Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, Book I., ch. 10.

*Archdeacon Paley*.—"In my opinion the transaction in the wilderness, above recited, (Exod. xvi.), was the first actual institution of the Sabbath. For if the Sabbath had been instituted at the time of the creation, as the words in Genesis may seem at first sight to import; and if it had been observed all along from that time to the departure of the Jews out of Egypt, a period of about two thousand five hundred years, it appears unaccountable that no mention of it, no occasion of even the obscurest allusion to it, should occur, either in the general history of the world before the call of Abraham, which contains, we admit, only a few memoirs of its early ages, and those extremely abridged; or, which is more to be wondered at, in that of the lives



of the first three Jewish patriarchs, which in many parts of the account is sufficiently circumstantial and domestic. Nor is there, in the passage above quoted, (he has mentioned Exod. c. xvi.,) any intimation that the Sabbath, when appointed to be observed, was only the revival of an ancient institution, which had been neglected, forgotten, or suspended; nor is any such neglect imputed either to the inhabitants of the Old World, or to any part of the family of Noah; nor, lastly, is any permission recorded to dispense with the institution during the captivity of the Jews in Egypt, or on any other public emergency." And then he proceeds, "The passage in the second chapter of Genesis, which creates the whole controversy on the subject, is not inconsistent with this opinion: for, as the seventh day was erected into a Sabbath, on account of God's resting upon that day from the work of creation, it was natural enough in the historian, when he had related the history of the creation, and of God's ceasing from it on the seventh day, to add, 'And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that on it He had rested from all His work which God had created and made;' although the blessing and sanctification, *i. e.*, the religious distinction and appropriation of that day, were not actually made till many ages afterwards. The words do not assert, that God *then* 'blessed and sanctified' the seventh day, but that He blessed and sanctified it *for that reason*; and if any ask, why the Sabbath, or the sanctification of the seventh day, was *then* mentioned, if it was not *then* appointed? the answer is at hand: the order of connection and not of time introduced the mention of the Sabbath in the history of the subject which it was ordained to commemorate."—*The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, chap. 7.

It would be easy to multiply the above, as any one will see who takes the trouble to consult the index to Mr. Cox's *Literature of the Sabbath Question*. The whole subject is fully discussed in the 4th of Dr. Hesse's *Bampton Lectures*, to which I refer.

#### O.—PAGE 27.

"What has been said regarding the falling of the manna as a proof of an earlier Sabbath, . . . has received a different, and, in my opinion, a more probable interpretation."

Thus *John Milton*.—"The injunction respecting the celebration of the Sabbath in the wilderness, (Exod. xvi.,) a short time previous to the delivery of the law, namely, that no one should go out to gather manna on the seventh morning, because God had said that he would not rain it from heaven on that day, seems rather to have been intended as a preparatory notice, the groundwork, as it were, of a law for the Israelites, to be delivered shortly afterwards in a clearer manner; they having been previously ignorant of the mode of observing the Sabbath. Compare ver. 5 with ver. 22-30. For the rulers of the congregation, who ought to have been better acquainted than the rest with the commandment of the Sabbath, if any such institution then existed, wondered why the people gathered twice as much on the sixth day, and appealed to Moses; who, then, as if announcing something new, proclaimed to them that the morrow would be the Sabbath. After which, as if he had already related in what manner the Sabbath was for the first time observed, he proceeds, ver. 30, 'so the people rested on the seventh day.' That the Israelites had not so much as heard of the Sabbath before this time, seems to be confirmed by several passages of the prophets. (Ezek. xx. 10-12;) 'I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness; and I gave them my statutes, and shewed them my judgments. . . . Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am Jehovah that sanctify them.' (Neh. ix. 13, 14:) 'thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai . . . and gavest them right judgments . . . and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant.'"—*Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, i., chap. 10.

And Hengstenberg.—“When a double portion fell on the sixth day, (for which God had prepared Moses, though the latter had certainly not mentioned it to the people), the rulers came and told Moses. They are astonished at the providence of God, that they had found a double quantity of manna, and ask what they are to do with it. The reply which Moses makes them, shews us the reason of their bringing him the information. This to them inexplicable occurrence is *first* explained in his reply. *Then follow* directions how to dispose of the surplus. Now, neither of these, the astonishment or the perplexity, could have arisen, if the Sabbath had been already known and observed. We are led to the same conclusion, when we find that, notwithstanding the instructions of Moses, some of the people went out on the Sabbath to gather, shewing how new a thing it was to the people, and how difficult it was at first to conform. And we infer it also from the total absence in the words of Moses of a reference to an already existing Sabbath ordinance. Liebetrut indeed thinks that the words of Moses, ‘This is that which the Lord said,’ shew that the Sabbath was already known, since no such declaration is made in verses 4 and 5. But Moses is not referring here to an earlier declaration of the Lord, but to something actually said by the Lord when pouring out the double portion of manna on the sixth day: ‘This is that which the Lord hath said (by this occurrence), To-morrow is the rest of a holy Sabbath to the Lord.’ No doubt remains then,” says the same writer, “that the Sabbath was first instituted in connection with the whole of the Mosaic economy. ‘The Lord hath given you the Sabbath.’”—Hengstenberg *On the Lord’s-day*, p. 7.

P.—PAGE 27.

“*I am astonished that so much has been made of the word ‘remember.’*”

The compilers of our *Larger Catechism* did not find any difficulty in interpreting this phrase with me:—

“The word *remember* is set in the beginning of the Fourth Commandment, partly, because of the great benefit of remembering it, we being thereby helped in our preparation to keep it, and, in keeping it, better to keep all the rest of the commandments, and to continue a thankful remembrance of the two great benefits of creation and redemption, which contain a short abridgment of religion; and partly, because we are very ready to forget it, for that there is less light of nature for it, and yet it restraineth our natural liberty in things at other times lawful; that it cometh but once in seven days, and many worldly businesses come between, and too often take off our minds from thinking of it, either to prepare for it, or to sanctify it; and that Satan with his instruments much labour to blot out the glory, and even the memory of it, to bring in all irreligion and impiety.”—*Question* 121. Nothing *here*, at least, about a primeval Sabbath.

Whately, in his *Thoughts on the Sabbath*, p. 13, (3d Ed.,) expresses my view with his usual clearness:—“Nor does the expression, ‘*remember the Sabbath-day*,’ necessarily imply its having been *before* observed; but rather that the precept was one liable to be violated through negligence and *forgetfulness*. We often say, in like manner, ‘*remember to call at such a place, at such an hour*;’ or ‘*remember to deliver this letter*,’ &c.; meaning, ‘take care not to forget it.’ It is not said, accordingly, ‘*remember not to steal*,’ ‘*remember to honour your parents*,’ &c., though, certainly, *these* precepts must have been always in force; but they are such as no one is likely to violate through forgetfulness.”

Q.—PAGE 27.

“*Another argument in proof of the same position has been adduced from the fact, that the Sabbath, according to Christ’s prediction, should continue after His death, when He said, ‘Pray that your flight be not in winter.’*”

Dr. Hessey writes, (Lect. 5.)—“In a nation like that of the Jews, in which the fiction of the ‘Sabbath-day’s journey’ prevailed extensively, it

was no doubt considered wrong to assist the traveller, however urgent his errand, in his movements on the Sabbath-day. All possible impediments, therefore, would be thrown in the way of the fugitives, by those who were still zealous for the supposed requirements of the law. They would render them no aid, they would assail with obloquy, if with nothing worse, the violators of the sanctity of the Sabbath. A Roman Satirist asserted of the Jews, that they considered it to be their duty

‘Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,  
Quasitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.’

If this were so, they would certainly be yet more uncharitable to those who were in their eyes not merely aliens, but apostates; not merely ignorant of their law, but despisers of it and contributors to its overthrow. What wonder, then, that our blessed Lord, foreseeing that the Sabbath would still exist as a fact, though no longer obligatory as an institution, and would still be cherished by the Jews, should have bid His disciples pray, that their flight be not cast, not merely in the time of winter, but on a day which would expose them to the yet keener blasts of those who would resent a violation of their ancient day of rest. It may be that our Lord foresaw a lingering regard on the part of His disciples for this remnant of the Jewish law, such as we know the Nazarenes long entertained, and that He hinted at what their personal feelings would be. Of this, however, we have no evidence. Perhaps, then, it is safer to conclude that He spoke merely of a certain external circumstance, the averting of which, as its presence would increase their trials, should be made the subject of prayer.”

The same view I find in an old Baptist author of some celebrity in the seventeenth century, Benjamin Keach.—“Therefore this,” says he, “I take to be the direct meaning of our blessed Lord, viz., because on the Jewish Sabbath-day the unbelieving Jews, among whom you will remain (or many of you), when the destruction of the city comes, may be so strict and superstitious as to keep watch and ward at every gate and way, that you will not be able to escape, at least not above one of their Sabbath-day’s journey; therefore pray your flight be not on that day. This is all I can see in this text.”—*The Jewish Sabbath Abrogated*, p. 148.

Well may Hengstenberg write, that if this text were to be taken as in favour of Sabbatical observance, “the Saviour is but helping to build up, what He always aimed to overthrow,—the scruples of the Pharisees with regard to the outward observance of the Sabbath.”—*On the Lord’s-day*, p. 106.

#### R.—PAGE 28.

“Then, again, it has been strongly urged that the phrase, ‘The Sabbath was made for man,’ proves it to have been for man *as man*, or for humanity.”

My illustration of the drowning man and the gold was suggested by the recollection of a passage in Dr. Hesse’s 4th Lecture:—

“The real question was, Which is the more important,—the Sabbath or man? Which is the more precious in God’s sight, the ordinance or the moral being? which is the end? which is made for the other? Our Lord replies, ‘The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.’ Just as if a person were about to sacrifice his life for the preservation of his gold,—one would say to him, ‘Gold was made for man, not man for gold.’ This would not of course imply that gold and no other sort of money must necessarily be for ever the medium of commerce. Such might or might not be the case, but it could not be gathered legitimately from the mere terms of the expostulation.”

#### S.—PAGE 31.

“It is, first of all, adapted to our whole wants as men and as Christians,—  
adapted to our wants physically.”

I may refer to M. Proudhon’s Pamphlet, *De la Celebration du Dimanche considereé sous les rapports de l’Hygiène publique, de la Morale, des relations*



*de Famille et de Cité*, Paris, 1850, where the advantages of the precise proportion of six days of work to one of rest are pointed out. I have not seen this work, which was referred to by Mr. Charteris, but the value of such a testimony is great.

T.—PAGE 35.

The following quotations are intended to shew the views held by the early Reformers and other Protestant divines. It will be observed that some of these writers go far beyond my views:—

*Luther*.—"God set apart the seventh day, and appointed it to be observed, and commanded that it should be considered holy above all others; and this command, as far as the outward observance is concerned, was given to the Jews alone, that they should abstain from hard labour, and rest, in order that both man and beast might be refreshed, and not be worn out by constant work. Therefore this commandment, literally understood, does not apply to us Christians; for it is entirely outward, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, bound to modes, and persons, and times and customs, all of which are now left free by Christ. But in order that the simple may obtain a Christian view of that which God requires of us in this commandment, observe that we keep a festival, not for the sake of intelligent and advanced Christians, for these have no need of it; but first for the sake of the body, because Nature teaches that the working-classes, servants and maids, who have spent the whole week in their work and occupation, absolutely require a day in which they can leave off work, and rest and refresh themselves; and, chiefly, in order that men may, on such a day of rest, have time and opportunity, such as they could not otherwise have, to attend to the worship of God, that so they may come in crowds, to hear the word of God and practise it, to praise God, and sing, and pray. But this is not bound to any particular time, as with the Jews, so that it must be this day or that; for no day is in itself better than any other, but it ought to be performed daily; only, because this would be impossible to the mass of the people, we must at least devote one day to this purpose. And because Sunday has been appointed from the earliest times, we ought to keep to this arrangement, that all things may be done in harmony and order, and no confusion be caused by unnecessary novelties."—*Luther's Larger Catechism*.—Martin's translation of Hengstenberg *On the Lord's-day*, p. 62.

And again—"As for the Sabbath or Sunday, there is no necessity for its observance; and if we do so, the reason ought to be, not because Moses commanded it, but because Nature likewise teaches us to give ourselves, from time to time, a day's rest, in order that man and beast may recruit their strength, and that we may go and hear the Word of God preached."—*Werke*, 11, 16: quoted in Hazlitt's translation of Michelet's *Life of Luther*, p. 271. Lond., 1846.

*Calvin*.—Commenting on Galatians iv. 10, "Ye observe days, and months, and years," he remarks. "When certain days are represented as holy in themselves, when one day is distinguished from another on religious grounds, when holy days are reckoned a part of divine worship, then days are improperly observed. The Jewish Sabbath, new moons, and other festivals, were earnestly pressed by the false apostles, because they had been appointed by the law. When we, in the present age, make a distinction of days, we do not represent them as necessary, and thus lay a snare for the conscience; we do not reckon one day to be more holy than another; we do not make days to be the same thing with religion and the worship of God; but merely attend to the preservation of order and harmony. The observance of days among us is a free service, and void of all superstition." And again—"It was not, however, without a reason that the early Christians substituted what we call the Lord's-day for the Sabbath. The resurrection of our Lord being the end and accomplishment of that true rest which the ancient Sabbath typified, this day, by which types were abolished, serves to warn Christians against adhering to a shadowy ceremony. I do not cling so to the

number seven as to bring the Church under bondage to it, nor do I condemn Churches for holding their meetings on other solemn days, provided they guard against superstition. This they will do if they employ those days merely for the observance of discipline and regular order."

*Confession of Augsburg, 1530.*—"What then is to be thought of the Lord's-day, and the like formalities of public worship? To this it is replied, that bishops or ministers have liberty to appoint forms of proceeding, that everything may go on regularly in the Church; not that by means of them we may merit the remission of our sins, or give satisfaction therefor, or that our consciences may be bound to regard them as necessary acts of worship, and the neglect of them as sinful, when others are not thereby made to stumble. Thus Paul ordains that in the congregation women shall cover their heads, that interpreters be heard in succession in church, and so on. Such regulations it is expedient, for the sake of love and peace, that churches observe so far, that no man may be a stumbling-block to another, and to the end that all things may be done in order and without disturbance in churches; yet so that men's consciences may not be burdened with the notion that these are things necessary to salvation, and that the neglect of them without offence to others is sinful—as nobody will say that a woman sins if, without offence to any, she goes about publicly with her head uncovered. Of this nature is the observation of the Lord's-day, of Easter, Whitsuntide, and the like holidays and ceremonies. For those who think that the observance of the Lord's-day has been appointed by the authority of the Church instead of the Sabbath, as a thing necessary, greatly err. The Scripture allows that we are not bound to keep the Sabbath; for it teaches, that the ceremonies of the law of Moses are not necessary after the revelation of the Gospel. And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when to assemble together, it appears that the Church appointed for this purpose the Lord's-day, which for this reason also seemed to have pleased the more, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observance, neither of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, is necessary."—*Art. De Potestate Ecclesiastica*, p. 156, Oxford Ed., 1827.

*Beza.*—"We declare it superstitious," says he, "to believe that one day is more holy than another, and that resting from daily labours is in itself pleasing to God. Nevertheless we keep holy one day in seven, as the Lord has commanded; that is, we devote it entirely to the holding of assemblies and hearing the word of God, but without any Jewish ceremony or foolish superstition; on which account also we follow the custom of the ancient Church, in choosing for that purpose, not the Sabbath, but the Lord's-day."—*Confessio Christianæ Fidei*, cap. v., § 41. And again—"Therefore, the religious assemblies of the Lord's-day are of apostolical and truly divine tradition, yet so that a Judaical rest from all work is by no means to be observed; since this were plainly not to abolish Judaism, but only to change what respected the day. Afterwards, however, cessation from labour was introduced by the Emperor Constantine, as appears from Eusebius and the laws of the emperor in the Code, and was more and more strictly enforced by the succeeding emperors; until at last, what was at first instituted for a good purpose, and is still deservedly retained—namely, that the mind, freed from daily labours, should give itself wholly up to the hearing of the Word of God—came to degenerate into mere Judaism, or rather, the vainest will-worship, innumerable other holy-days having been added to it."—*Note on Rev. i. 10.*

*Archbishop Cranmer.*—"And here note, good children, that the Jews in the Old Testament were commanded to keep the Sabbath-day; and they observed it every seventh-day, called the Sabbath or Saturday. But we Christian men in the New Testament are not bound to such commandments of Moses' law concerning differences of times, days, and meats, but have liberty and freedom to use other days for our sabbath-days, therein to hear the Word of God, and to keep a holy rest."—*A short Instruction into Christian Religion, being a Catechism set forth by Archbishop Cranmer, in 1558*, p. 40. Oxford, 1829.

*John Knox*.—"We confess and acknowledge, that God has given to man his holy law, in which not only are forbidden all such works which offend and displease his Godly Majesty, but also are commanded all such as please him, and as he hath promised to reward. And these works be of two sorts: the one are done to the honour of God, the other to the profit of our neighbours, and both have the revealed will of God for their assurance. To have one God; to worship and honour him; to call upon him in all our troubles; to reverence his holy name; to hear his Word; to believe the same; to communicate with his holy sacraments;—are the works of the First Table. To honour father, mother, princes, rulers, and superior powers; to love them; to support them, yea, to obey their charges (not repugning to the commandment of God); to save the lives of innocents; to repress tyranny; to defend the oppressed; to keep our bodies clean and holy; to live in sobriety and temperance; to deal justly with all men, both in word and in deed; and finally, to repress all appetite of our neighbour's hurt;—are the good works of the Second Table, which are most pleasing and acceptable unto God, as those works that are commanded by himself."—*First Confession of Faith of the Church of Scotland*, A.D. 1560, chap. 16.—*Knox's Works*, ii., p. 107. (Edin., 1848.) I quote this for the remarkable omission of anything bearing on the Fourth Commandment, except the duty of hearing the word and communicating.

*Grotius*, 1645.—"Referring to Eusebius for proof, that Constantine, besides suspending labour on Sunday, enacted that the people should not be brought before the tribunals on Saturday, which was long observed by the primitive Christians for religious meetings." He adds, that this "refutes those who think that the Lord's-day was substituted for the Sabbath—a thing nowhere mentioned either by Christ or his apostles. And the Apostle, when he says that Christians are not to be judged in respect of Sabbaths or New Moons (Col. ii. 16,) shews them to be free from the law of resting from labour; which freedom would be none at all if the law remained in force, with merely a change of the day."—*Opera omnia*, 1679, vol. i. p. 45.

*Jeremy Taylor*.—"The primitive Church kept both the Sabbath and the Lord's-day till the time of the Laodicean Council, about three hundred years after Christ's nativity, and almost in every thing made them equal; and, therefore, did not esteem the Lord's-day to be substituted in the place of the obliterated Sabbath, but a feast celebrated by great reason and perpetual consent, without precept or necessary Divine injunction. But the liberty of the Church was great: they found themselves disobliged from that strict and necessary rest which was one great part of the Sabbatic rites; only they were glad of the occasion to meet often for offices of religion, and the day served well for the gaining and facilitating the conversion of the Jews, and for the honourable sepulture of the synagogue, it being kept so long, like the forty days' mourning of Israel for the death of their father Jacob."—*Life of Jesus*, ii. 12, Disc. 10. And again—"The Jewish Sabbath being abrogated, the Christian liberty, like the sun after the dispersion of the clouds, appeared in its full splendour: and then the division of days ceased, and one day was not more holy than another, as St. Paul disputes in his Epistle to the Galatians (Gal. iv. 10), and from him St. Jerome (*in hunc locum*;) and when St. Paul reproved the Corinthians for going to law before the unbelievers, who kept their court-days upon the first day of the week, he would not have omitted to reprove them by so great and weighty a circumstance as the profaning the Lord's-day, in case it had been then a holy day, either of Divine or apostolical institution; for when, afterwards, it grew into an ecclesiastical law, and either by law or custom was observed together with the Jewish Sabbath, Constantine (*apud Euseb.*) made a favourable edict, that the Christian should not be impleaded on those two festivals. Of which I only make use to this purpose, that among the Gentiles these were law-days; and therefore the Corinthians must needs have been profaners of that day by their law suits, and therefore have been, upon that account, obnoxious to the apostolical rod, if the day had then, in any sense of authority, been esteemed holy."—*Ductor Dubitantium*, ii., ch. 2, Rule 6, § 54.

*John Bunyan*.—"From all this, therefore, I conclude that there is a difference to be put between the morality of the law, and the ministration of it upon Sinai. The law, as to its morality, was before; but as to *this* ministration, it was not till the Church was with Moses, and he with the angels on Mount Sinai in the wilderness. Now in the law, as moral, we conclude a time propounded, but no seventh-day Sabbath enjoined. But in that law, as thus ministered,—which ministration is already out of doors,—we find a seventh day; that seventh day on which God rested, on which God rested from all His works, enjoined. What is it then? Why the whole ministration as written and engraven in stones being removed, the seventh-



day Sabbath must also be removed; for that the *time*, nor yet the *day*, was as to our holy Sabbath, or rest, moral; but imposed with that whole ministration, as such, upon the Church, until the time of reformation: which time being come, this ministration, as I said, as such, ceaseth; and the whole law, as to the morality of it, is delivered into the hand of Christ, who imposes it now also; but not as a law of works, nor as that ministration written and engraven in stones, but as a rule of life to those that have believed in Him. (1 Co. ix. 21.) So then, that law is still moral, and still supposes, since it teaches that there is a God, that time must be set apart for His Church to worship Him in, according to that will of His that He had revealed in His word. But though by that law *time* is required, yet by that, as moral, the time never was prefixed. The time, then, of old was appointed by such a ministration of that law as we have been now discoursing of; and when that ministration ceaseth, that time did also vanish with it. And now by our new lawgiver, the Son of God, He being 'Lord also of the Sabbath-day,' we have a time prefixed, as the law of nature requireth, a *new day*, by him who is the Lord of it; I say, appointed, wherein we may worship, not in the oldness of that letter written and engraven in stones, but according to, and most agreeing with, His New and Holy Testament."—*Questions on the Seventh-day Sabbath, ut supra*, pp. 367-8.

*Dr. Isaac Barrow*.—"Seeing, therefore, the observation of the Sabbath is expressed to have a peculiar respect to the children of Israel, as a sign of the covenant made with them when He led them out of Egypt; seeing, in its own nature, it differeth from the rest of the 'Ten Laws,' the obligation thereto being not, discernibly to natural light, grounded in the reason of the thing, we can nowise be assured that an universal and perpetual obligation thereto was intended, or that its obligation did extend further than to the Jews, to whom it was as a formal law delivered, and upon special considerations severely inculcated; to whose humour, condition, and circumstances, it might also perhaps be particularly suited: Justin Martyr was of opinion that this law, as many others, was given to the Jews 'for their iniquity and hardness of heart,' by way of concession and indulgence. . . . However, that this law (as to its circumstantial parts) was not intended to oblige generally and perpetually, we have a most forcible ground to suppose; St. Paul himself, his express discharging Christians from the observation thereof; yea, his earnest reprehension of some persons for rigorously insisting thereon, deeming it themselves, and urging it upon others, as a necessary duty to observe it; his conjoining it with other ceremonial observances, whose nature was merely symbolical, and whose design was to continue no longer than till the real substance of that which they represented came into full force and practice."—*A Brief Exposition of the Lord's Prayer and the Decalogue*.—Works, vol. iii. Edin. 1847. And after commenting on the passages in Col. ii. 16-17, and Galat. iv. 10, he goes on:—"Again, in the 14th to the Romans, the same great patron and champion of Christian liberty not obscurely declareth his mind, that Christians of strength in judgment did regard no day above another, but esteemed all days (he excepteth none) alike, as to any special obligation, grounded upon divine law and right; in subordination to which doctrine we may add, that this appears with great evidence to have been the common opinion of the wisest and most orthodox Christians in the Primitive Church, the most constant and strict adherents to Catholic tradition (who from the Apostles' instruction best understood the purport and limits of the liberty purchased by Christ), that this law, as it was not known or practised before Moses, so it ceased to oblige after Christ; being one of the shadows which the evangelical light dispelled, one of the burdens which this law of liberty did take off us. Now, although upon these accounts we cannot press the strict observation of this law in all its parts, according to its literal and direct intention, yet we may learn much of our duty, much of God's will from it."—*Ib.*

*Archdeacon Jortin*.—"It appears from some passages in the New Testament, and from other ancient writings, that the disciples and their converts agreed to set apart for public worship the first day of the week, the day of Christ's resurrection, which was also the day on which He sent down the Holy Ghost upon His Apostles. By setting aside the Lord's-day for the solemn worship of God, they observed all that was moral in the Fourth Commandment—namely, a stated time for religious exercises; and they thought it proper to retain the same portion of time, one day in seven."—*Sermons*. London, 1772: vol. v., p. 93.

*Archdeacon Paley*.—"We admit that none of these reasons shew why Sunday should be preferred to any other day in the week, or one day in seven to one day in six or eight; but these points, which in their nature are of arbitrary determination, being established to our hands, our obligation applies to the subsisting establishment, so long as we confess that some such institution is necessary, and are

neither able, nor attempt to substitute any other in its place.”—*Moral Philosophy*, chap. 6. And again—“The conclusion from the whole inquiry (for it is our business to follow the arguments to whatever probability they conduct us), is this: The *assembling* upon the first day of the week for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction, is a law of Christianity, of Divine appointment; the *resting* on that day from our employments longer than we are detained from them by attendance upon these assemblies, is, to Christians, an ordinance of human institution—binding, nevertheless, upon the conscience of every individual of a country in which a weekly Sabbath is established, for the sake of the beneficial purposes which the public and regular observance of it promotes, and recommended perhaps, in some degree, to the Divine approbation, by the resemblance it bears to what God was pleased to make a solemn part of the law which He delivered to the people of Israel, and by its subserviency to many of the same uses.”—*Ib.*, chap. vii.

Dr. George Cook, Professor of Moral Philosophy at St. Andrews, speaking of the author of the *Homily De Tempore*, attributed by some to St. Augustine, says:—“It is evident that the object of this distinguished theologian was to rest the Lord’s-day upon a positive Divine appointment; he endeavours to shew that this may be deduced from the events which Scripture records as having taken place upon it; but not trusting altogether to such an inference, he introduces the doctors of the Church as having decided that the only change made by the Christian dispensation upon the Fourth Commandment was to transfer the rest which it enjoins from the seventh day of the week to the first. Assuming this, he immediately holds it forth, or considers it as a matter of Divine appointment, that the Lord’s-day was to be observed in all respects as the Jewish Sabbath had been. This is certainly proceeding much further than the New Testament seems to warrant, or even, if we may judge from their works, than is warranted by the earliest writers of the Church: and it is difficult to conceive, that when the apostles rank the Sabbath as amongst the Jewish rites abolished by Christianity, they should not have given even the most distant intimation, that all which they meant by this assertion was, that, on account of the resurrection of Christ, God was to be worshipped on the first day of the week instead of the seventh.”—*General and Historical View of Christianity*, ii., 301. And again—“The amount of this whole disquisition is, that the observance of the first day of the week, as a day of worship, is founded upon the law of nature, conjoined with the fact, that it is plain, from Scripture, that this particular day was set apart for that purpose by the apostles, and that in so far it may be considered of Divine appointment; but that it is not enforced, as was the Jewish Sabbath, to which, in primitive times, it was uniformly set in opposition; and that it is left very much to the discretion of particular Churches, or to the consciences of individuals, to determine how large a portion of the day should be devoted to religious services, and in what manner the remainder of it is to be occupied.”—*Ib.*, p. 319.

Dr. Arnold.—“I believe that it is generally agreed amongst Christians, that the Jewish Law, so far as it was Jewish and not moral, is at an end; and it is assuming the whole point at issue to assume that the Ten Commandments are all moral. If that were so, it seems to me quite certain that the Sabbath would have been kept on its own proper day; for if the Commandments were still binding, I do not see where would be the power to make any alteration in its enactments. But it is also true, no doubt, that the Lord’s-day was kept from time immemorial in the Church as a day of festival; and, connected with the notion of festival, the abstinence from worldly business naturally followed. A weekly religious festival, in which worldly business was suspended, bore such a resemblance to the Sabbath, that the analogy of the Jewish Law was often urged as a reason for its observance; but as it was not considered to be the Sabbath, but only a day in some respects like it, so the manner of its observance varied from time to time, and was made more or less strict on grounds of religious expediency, without reference, in either case, to the authority of the Fourth Commandment. . . . And the clear language of this Statute, (5 and 6 Edward VI., cap. 3,) together with the total omission of the duty of keeping the Sabbath in the Catechism, although it professes to collect our duty towards God from the four first commandments, proves to my mind, that in using the Fourth Commandment in the Church service, the Reformers meant it to be understood as an enforcing to us simply the duty of worshipping God, and devoting some portion of time to His honour; the particular portion so devoted, and the manner of observing it, being points to be fixed by the Church. It is on these grounds that I should prefer greatly diminishing public travelling on the Sunday to stopping it altogether; as this seems to me to corres-

pond better with the Christian observance of the Lord's-day, which, while most properly making rest from ordinary occupation the general rule, yet does not regard it as a thing of absolute necessity, but to be waived on weighty grounds. And surely many very weighty reasons for occasionally moving from place to place on a Sunday are occurring constantly. But if the only alternative be between stopping the trains on our railways altogether, or having them go frequently, as on other days, I cannot hesitate for an instant which side to take, and I will send you my proxy without a moment's hesitation."—*Life*, vol. ii., p. 207-9.

Dr. Alford, Dean of Canterbury, and author of the *Greek Testament*, with a *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, who adopts the same view with Dr. Hook, in commenting on Romans xiv. 5, writes thus:—"It is an interesting question, what indication is here found of the observance or non-observance of a day of obligation in the apostolic times. The Apostle *decides nothing*; leaving *every man's own mind* to guide him in the point. He classes the observance or non-observance of particular days with the eating or abstaining from particular meats. In both cases he is concerned with things which he evidently treats as of *absolute indifference in themselves*. Now the question is, supposing the Divine obligation of one day in seven to have been recognized by him *in any form*, could he have thus spoken? The obvious inference from his strain of arguing is, that he *knew of no such obligation*, but believed *all times and days to be*, to the Christian strong in faith, *ALIKE*. I do not see how the passage can be otherwise understood. If any one day in the week were invested with the sacred character of the Sabbath, it would have been *wholly impossible* for the Apostle to commend or uphold the man who judged all days worthy of equal honour, who, as in verse 6, paid *no regard to the (any) day*. He must have visited him with his strongest disapprobation, as violating a command of God. *I therefore infer, that Sabbatical obligation to keep any day, whether seventh or first, was not recognized in apostolic times*. It must be carefully remembered, that this inference does not concern the question of the observance of the Lord's-day as an institution of the Christian Church, analogous to the ancient Sabbath, binding on us from considerations of humanity and religious expediency, and by the rules of that branch of the Church in which Providence has placed us, but not in any way inheriting the divinely-appointed obligation of the other, or the strict prohibitions by which its sanctity was defended. The reply commonly furnished to these considerations, viz., that the Apostle was speaking here only of Jewish festivals, and therefore cannot refer to Christian ones, is a quibble of the poorest kind; its assertors themselves distinctly maintaining the obligation of one such Jewish festival on Christians. What I maintain is, that had the Apostle believed as they do, he could not by any possibility have written thus. Besides, in the face of *πᾶσαν ἡμέραν* ['every day'] the assertion is altogether unfounded." And again, commenting on Colossians ii. 16, 17, he writes:—"We may observe, that if the ordinance of the Sabbath had been, *in any form*, of lasting obligation on the Christian Church, it would have been quite impossible for the Apostle to have spoken thus. The fact of an obligatory rest of one day, whether the seventh or the first, would have been directly in the teeth of his assertion here: the holding of such would have been still to retain the shadow, while we possess the substance. And no answer can be given to this by the transparent special pleading, that he was speaking only of that which was *Jewish* in such observance: the whole argument being general, and the axiom of verse 17 universally applicable."

Dr. John Eadie, Professor of Biblical Literature, United Presbyterian Church, Glasgow.—In his *Commentary on the Colossians*, he remarks on chapter ii., verse 16:—"‘Let no man therefore judge you . . . in the particular of Sabbath days.’ Some, indeed, such as Neumann, suppose the allusion to be to the grand Sabbatic periods of the seventh day, the seventh year, and the fiftieth year. But there is no warrant or necessity for such a reference here, though the Apostle says, to the Galatians, ‘Ye observe days and months, and times and years,’ (Rom. xiv. 5, 6.) The term *σάββατον* often occurs in a plural form in the New Testament, as if, as Winer supposes, the Syro-Chaldaic form had been transferred into the Greek tongue. Matt. xii. 1; Luke iv. 16; Acts xiii. 14; xvi. 13. Allusions to these feasts, collectively, will be found in 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4; xxxi. 3. The observances of the Jewish rubric, whether in its original form or with the multiplied and ascetic additions which it presented in those days, laid believers no longer under obligation. They belonged to an obsolete system, which had ‘decayed and waxed old.’ Christianity inculcated no such periodical holidays. For it did not bid men meet thrice a-year to feast themselves, but each day to ‘eat their bread with gladness and singleness of heart.’ It did not summon them to



any tumultuous demonstration with 'trumpets at new moon,' since every division of the month was a testimony of Divine goodness, and the whole kalendar was marked by Divine benefactions—every day alike a season of prayer and joy. Nor were they to hallow the 'sabbaths,' for these had served their purpose, and the Lord's-day was now to be a season of loftier joy, as it commemorates a more august event than either the creation of the universe or the exodus from Egypt. Every period is sanctified—'day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night teacheth knowledge.' Sensations of spiritual joy are not to be restricted to holy days, for they thrill the spirit every moment, and need not wait for expression till there be a solemn gathering, for every instant awakes to the claims and the raptures of religion. The new religion is too free and exuberant to be trained down to 'times and seasons,' like its tame and rudimental predecessor. Its feast is daily, for every day is holy; its moon never wanes, and its serene tranquillity is an unbroken Sabbath. The Jewish Sabbath was kept, however, by the early Christians along with their own Lord's-day for a considerable period; till, at length, in 364, A.D., the Council of Laodicea condemned the practice as Judaizing."

Looking back on the various opinions expressed in the passages cited above and in the previous articles of this Appendix, may not one's thoughts find a fitting expression in the words of Dr. Watts, who, while he himself adhered to what it is now the fashion to call the orthodox opinion on this much debated question, yet thus wrote (*The Holiness of Times, Places, and People under the Jewish and Christian Dispensations considered and compared—Works*, ii., 501, Lond., 1810):—"Since all Jewish festivals, New Moons, and Sabbaths, are abolished by St. Paul's authority, in such express and unlimited language as may lead many sincere Christians to believe that all manner of distinction of days whatsoever, whether Jewish or Patriarchal, is finished; since the religious observation of days, in the 14th chapter to the Romans, in general, is represented as a matter of doubtful disputation; since the observation of the Lord's-day is not built upon any express and plain institution by Christ or His Apostles in the New Testament, but rather on examples and probable inferences, and on the reasons and relations of things, I can never pronounce anything hard or severe upon any fellow-Christian who maintains real piety in heart and life, though his opinion may be very different from mine on this subject. Nor does any man, who is humbly and sincerely studious of truth and duty, and desirous to find it, deserve any reproach or censure upon the account of different opinions about meats and days; unless he assume such haughty airs of assurance as arise far beyond all his evidence and proof, or indulge a persecuting spirit, and reproach his brethren who differ from him."—Pp. 69, 70.

#### U.—PAGE 36.

"But this leads me to consider a little further what has been said by preceding speakers regarding the Lord's-day being the old Sabbath revived."

This point has been already illustrated in this Appendix. The following letter furnishes a striking illustration of the view that I have maintained:—

"DEAR DR. MACLEOD,

"86 Bath Street, 22d Nov., 1865.

"I agree with you that it is hardly possible to bring forward anything new on the Sabbath question; but there is one argument of great force, which, though not new, is much less known than it deserves to be. In all the Romance languages the word for Sunday means the Lord's-day—thus: Italian, *Domenica*; Spanish, *Domingo*; Provencal, *Dimenge*; French, *Dimanche*. On the other hand, the words for Saturday, in the same languages, are all derived from Sabbath—as: Italian, *Sabato*; Spanish, *Sabado*; Provencal, *Dissapte*. Even the French *Samedi*, though more corrupted, is from the same root, being derived from *Sabbati dies*, as the Provencal form from *dies Sabbati*. (See *Diez, Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, sub voce *Samedi*.) The same phenomenon meets us in modern Greek still more decisively, as the ancient words *Κυριακή* (Rev. i. 10) and *Σάββατον* are still retained. When we consider the extraordinary persistence of words of this class—our own forms are of pre-Christian origin—this almost amounts to a proof that, in the opinion of the early Latin and Greek speaking Christians, the Lord's-day was not the Sabbath; and that the modern theory of a transference of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first, for which no title of evidence has ever been produced, is a mere baseless fiction.—I am, yours truly,

JOHN D. CAMPBELL."

## V.—PAGE 43.

*Sessional Churches.*

The only reason why I speak at all of the Sessional Church recently opened by me, is, that from some experience it appears calculated to meet the wants of the working-classes in large cities. A few brief statements regarding some of its more leading objects may afford *hints* and save trouble to other labourers in the same field, and who long with me to make the Lord's-day a delight to those who have not known the Lord. The church is seated for 900; its cost, with site, has been about £3,000. Upwards of two thousand of the working-classes subscribed for the church. A free site was given by Mr. Stirling Crawford. Friends subscribed for "ornament," as distinct from their subscriptions for building, to enable me to add to its beauty by stained-glass windows, &c. One friend (Mrs. Black) has herself added a memorial window, executed at Dresden,—the object of all such ornament being to treat the working-classes *with respect*, by making the useful beautiful also, in their House of Prayer.

Among our rules for working the church are the following:—

1. It is superintended by a Licentiate of the Church, but who is not ordained. His minimum salary is £100. He is appointed or removed by the kirk-session.

2. There is a Committee of Management, consisting of elders and deacons, who manage the ordinary affairs of the church, and report to the monthly meeting of kirk-session.

3. There are two services on the Lord's-day—one in the evening at seven o'clock, to which those only are admitted who come in their ordinary working clothes. No seats are allocated at those "evangelistic services." The *day* meeting is at 2.30, so that working-men can attend, in their ordinary clothes, if they have no better, without being noticed by the well-dressed going to worship at the usual church hour (two o'clock); but no distinction is made as to dress at the usual day service. *Seats are allocated* for this service to those in communion with the church, or to any others wishing to attend. *No seat rents, though allocated, are charged.*

4. The Sacraments are dispensed in the church, as in the Parish Church, by the parish minister. The Lord's Supper is dispensed three times a-year, in the evening.

5. The attendance of persons at the meetings held on the Lord's-day in any part of the parish by the Missionaries duly appointed by the session, is recognized as attending "church." Those found qualified for communion by the Missionaries receive it in the Mission Church; and they also receive Baptism for their children. To prevent sectarian proselytism, no one in communion with any other church is admitted to church membership.

6. The forenoons of the Lord's-day are occupied by giving catechetical instruction to adults at one hour, and the children of the church members at another hour.

7. Elders or laymen, approved of by the parish minister, are permitted to address the evening meeting.

The church has hitherto succeeded. It is always full at night; well attended during the day; and 150 persons in their working clothes sat down at the first communion. The collections average about £1 10s. each Lord's-day.

Missionaries, both male and female, are in connection with the church.

The Licentiate visits the communicants, and also a fixed district near the church.

A Penny Savings Bank, Clothing Society, Lecture Hall, &c., are connected with it.

The parish minister preaches as frequently as possible in the evenings.

An organ is used to lead the singing, in which all heartily join.

Week-day evening classes are held in a Sessional School, situated in the district, for adults above sixteen, and for juniors below this age (meeting in a different room), superintended by six certificated Government teachers, afford education to men and women at the rate of 3s. a-quarter. These schools are attended by about 180, and have been most successful—the pupils varying from ten to fifty years of age.

Such Sessional Churches, with the Mission and educational organization connected with them, are more economical, and far more easily adapted to meet the wants of poor localities, than ill paid chapels, allowed to sink or swim as they best can. I strongly advocate the extension of Sessional Churches in connection with, and as parts of, the Parish Church.







# THE SABBATH QUESTION

I.

## THE BIBLICAL CRITICISM OF THE GLASGOW PRESBYTERY CRITICIZED. BY A CHAPEL MINISTER.

WITH A PREFATORY NOTE BY DR. MACLEOD.

[In a few days—Price 6d.]

II.

## THE LORD'S DAY:

A SERMON PREACHED IN ST. MATTHEW'S PARISH CHURCH,  
GLASGOW, ON SUNDAY, 26th NOV., 1865.

BY THE REV. ALEXANDER M'QUISTEN, M.A.

[Ready—3d Edition, 6d.]

III.

## THE NEW LAW OR THE OLD?

A SERMON PREACHED IN ROSENEATH CHURCH, 26th NOV., 1865.

BY ROBERT HERBERT STORY,  
MINISTER OF ROSENEATH.

[Ready—Price 6d.]